

भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित

PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 31]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, जुलाई 30, 1983/श्रावण 8, 1905

No. 31]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, JULY 30, 1983/SRAVANA 8, 1905

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किये गये सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
tatutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय
(विधि कार्य विभाग)

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 2 जुलाई, 1983

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Legal Affairs)

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 2nd July, 1983

का० आ० 2984:—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री मारकण्ड चिमनलाल गांधी, एडवोकेट ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे प्रार्थना समाज एरिया गिरगांव सी० पी० टैंक और मीडो स्ट्रीट एरिया बम्बई व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

S.O. 2984.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Markand Chimanlal Gandhi, Advocate 79, Meadows Street, Fort, Bombay-400023 for appointment as a Notary to practise in the Prarthana Samaj Area, Girgaum, CP Tank and Meadows Street area in proper Bombay.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[सं० एफ० 5(52)/83-न्या०]

[No. F. 5(52)/83-Judl.]

सूचना

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 2985:—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्रीमती भूपिन्द कौर, एडवोकेट, जालंधर ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अधीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जालंधर (पंजाब) में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० एफ० 5(53)/83-न्या०]

के० सी० डी० गंगवाणी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

NOTICE

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1983

S.O. 2985.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Smt. Bhupinder Kaur, Advocate, Jullundur (Punjab), for appointment as a Notary to practise in Jullundur.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(53)/83-Judl.]

K. C. D. GANGWANI, Competent Authority.

गृह मंत्रालय

(कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 2986:—राष्ट्रपति, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 148 के खण्ड (5) के साथ पठित अनुच्छेद 309 के परन्तुक द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारतीय लेखापरीक्षा और लेखा विभाग में सेवा कर रहे व्यक्तियों के संबंध में निरंतर महालेखा परीक्षक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन संरक्षीकरण) नियम, 1981 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाते हैं, अर्थात्:—

1. (1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन संरक्षीकरण) (संशोधन) नियम, 1983 है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन संरक्षीकरण) नियम, 1981 में—

(1) नियम 5 के उपनियम (2) में “प्ररूप 1” शब्द और अंक के पश्चात् “या प्ररूप 1 क” शब्द अंक और अक्षर अंतःस्थापित किए जाएंगे;

(2) नियम 6 के उपनियम (1) के खंड (1) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित खंड अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा अर्थात्:—

“(1क) नियम 13 के उपनियम (3) में निर्दिष्ट आवेदक की दशा में, उसकी सेवा निवृत्ति की तारीख के बाद की तारीख को अंतिम हो जाएगा;”

(3) नियम 12 के परन्तुक में, “प्ररूप 1” शब्द और अंक के पश्चात् “या प्ररूप 1क” शब्द, अंक और अक्षर अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे;

(4) नियम 13 के उपनियम (2) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित उपनियम अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

“(3) ऐसा सरकारी सेवक, जो अधिवाषिता प्राप्त करने पर सेवा निवृत्ति होने वाला है और पेंशन के संराशीकरण मूल्य का संदाय, पेंशन संदाय आदेश के जारी किए जाने के समय प्राधिकृत कराना चाहता है, सेवा निवृत्ति की तारीख के पूर्व पेंशन कागज पत्रों के साथ-साथ पेंशन के एक भाग के संराशीकरण के लिए आवेदन करने का उक्त दशा में पात्र होगा जब:

(क) सरकारी सेवक अधिवाषिता पेंशन पर ही सेवा निवृत्त होता है;

(ख) कार्यालय अध्यक्ष को प्ररूप 1क में आवेदन इस प्रकार प्रस्तुत किया जाता है कि वह कार्यालय अध्यक्ष के पास अधिवाषिता की तारीख से कम से कम तीन मास पूर्व पहुंच जाए;

(ग) ऐसा कोई भी आवेदन ग्रहण नहीं किया जाएगा यदि वह अवधि सरकारी सेवक की अधिवाषिता की तारीख से तीन मास से कम है; और

(घ) सरकार पेंशन के संराशीकृत मूल्य के संदाय करने के दायित्वाधीन नहीं होगी यदि सरकारी सेवक की अधिवाषिता की तारीख के पूर्व मृत्यु हो जाती है या वह ऐसी सेवा निवृत्ति के पूर्व पेंशन का दावा खो देता है।”

(5) नियम 14 में,—

(1) उप नियम (1) में—

(क) “उपनियम (1) के अधीन प्ररूप 1 में” शब्दों, कोष्ठकों और अंकों के पश्चात् “या उपनियम (3) के अधीन प्ररूप 1क में” शब्द कोष्ठक और अंक अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे;

(ख) खण्ड (ख) में, “प्ररूप 1” शब्द और अंक के पश्चात् “या प्ररूप 1क” शब्द अंक और अक्षर अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे;

(ग) खण्ड ग में, "प्ररूप 1" शब्द और अंक के पश्चात् "या प्ररूप 1क" शब्द अंक और अक्षर अन्तःस्थापित किए जाएंगे ;

(6) नियम 15 के उपनियम (2) के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित उपनियम अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात् :—

"(3)(क) लेखा अधिकारी, कार्यालय अध्यक्ष से प्ररूप 1क के प्राप्त होने पर यह अभिनिश्चित और सत्यापन करेगा कि क्या आवेदक की अधिवर्षिता पेंशन की रकम की संगणना कर ली गई है, और यदि नहीं की गई है तो पेंशन की रकम की अन्तिम रूप से संगणना करने की कार्रवाई करेगा जिससे कि पेंशन संदाय आदेश, आवेदक की सेवा-निवृत्ति की तारीख से एक मास पूर्व जारी किया जा सके।

(ख)(i) लेखा अधिकारी प्ररूप 1क में दी गई आवश्यक जानकारी का सत्यापन करने के पश्चात् पेंशन संदाय आदेश के दोनों अधिभागों पर निम्नलिखित विनिर्दिष्ट करेगा :—

- (क) संराशीकृत पेंशन की रकम,
- (ख) संराशीकृत पेंशन की रकम का संराशीकृत मूल्य,
- (ग) वह तारीख जिससे संराशीकृत मूल्य संदेय हो जाता है।

(ii) लेखा अधिकारी, आवेदक को उस तारीख की सूचना देगा जिसको पेंशन संदाय आदेश संवितरक प्राधिकारी को प्रेषित किया गया है साथ ही यह अनुदेश भी देगा कि आवेदक को प्राधिकारी से संराशीकृत मूल्य प्राप्त कर लेना चाहिए।

(iii) लेखा अधिकारी, संबंध संवितरक प्राधिकारी को पेंशन संदाय आदेश अप्रेषित करते समय उक्त प्राधिकारी का ध्यान नियम 6 के उपनियम (1) के परन्तुक की ओर आकर्षित करेगा जिससे कि संवितरक प्राधिकारी पेंशन संदाय आदेश में उस तारीख की बाबत प्रविष्टि कर सके जिसको पेंशन के संराशीकृत भाग के मद्दे पेंशन की रकम कम की जानी है।

(iv) लेखा अधिकारी, संवितरक प्राधिकारी से उस तारीख की सूचना देने का भी अनुरोध करेगा जिसको संराशीकृत मूल्य का संदाय आवेदक को किया गया है।"

(7) प्ररूप 1 के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित प्ररूप अन्तःस्थापित किया जाएगा :—

"प्ररूप 1क

[नियम 5(2), 12, 13(3), 14(1) और 15(3) देखिए]

स्वास्थ्य परीक्षा के बिना अधिवर्षिता पेंशन के भाग के संराशीकरण के लिए आवेदन का प्ररूप जब आवेदक यह चाहता है कि पेंशन के संराशीकृत मूल्य का संदाय, पेंशन संदाय आदेश के माध्यम से प्राधिकृत किया जाए।

(सेवा निवृत्ति के कम से कम तीन मास पूर्व दो प्रतियों में प्रस्तुत किया जाए)

भाग-1

सेवा में,

_____ (यहां कार्यालय अध्यक्ष का पदनाम और पूरा पता उपदर्शित करें)

विषय :—स्वास्थ्य परीक्षा के बिना पेंशन का संराशीकरण महोदय,

मैं केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (पेंशन संराशीकरण) नियम, 1981 के उपबन्धों के अनुसार अपनी पेंशन का भाग संराशीकृत करना चाहता हूं। आवश्यक विशिष्टियां नीचे दी गई हैं :—

1. नाम स्पष्ट (अक्षरों में)
2. पिता का नाम (महिला सरकारी सेवक की वशा में पति का नाम भी)
3. पदनाम
4. कार्यालय/विभाग/मंत्रालय का नाम जिसमें नियोजित है।
5. जन्म की तारीख (ईस्वी सन् में)
6. अधिवर्षिता या भू०नि० 56(घ) के अधीन दिए गए सेवा के विस्तार की समाप्ति पर सेवा निवृत्ति की तारीख

*7. अधिवर्षिता पेंशन का संराशीकरण के लिए प्रस्तावित भाग।

**8. वह संवितरक प्राधिकारी जिससे सेवानिवृत्ति के पश्चात् पेंशन ली जाएगी :—

(क) खजाना/उप खजाना

(खजाने/उप खजाने का नाम और पूरा पता उपदर्शित करें)

(ख) (i) नाम निर्देशित राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक की शाखा और डाक का पूरा पता।

(ii) बैंक खाता सं० जिसमें प्रतिमास मासिक पेंशन जमा की जाएगी।

(ग) मंत्रालय/विभाग/कार्यालय का लेखा अधिकारी

हस्ताक्षर

वर्तमान डाक का पता.....

स्थान.....

तारीख सेवानिवृत्ति के पश्चात् डाक का पता :

टिप्पण : पेंशन के संराशीकृत मूल्य का संदाय उस सवितरक प्राधिकारी के माध्यम से किया जाएगा जिससे पेंशन, सेवानिवृत्ति के पश्चात् ली जाएगी : कोई आवेदक पेंशन का संराशीकरण मूल्य उस सवितरक प्राधिकारी ने भिन्न सवितरण प्राधिकारी से प्राप्त नहीं कर सकेगा जिससे वह अपनी पेंशन लेगा।

*आवेदक के मासिक पेंशन का वह भाग (पेंशन के अधिक से अधिक एक तिहाई तक) जो वह संराशीकृत कराना चाहता है/चाहती है, उपदर्शित करना चाहिए न कि रुपयों में रकम।

*जो लागू न हो उसे काट दें।

भाग-2

(अभिस्वीकृति)

श्री/श्रीमती/कुमारी (नाम).....
.....(पदनाम).....से स्वास्थ्य परीक्षा के बिना ही पेंशन के भाग के संराशीकरण के लिए प्ररूप 1क के भाग-1 में आवेदन पत्र प्राप्त किया।

स्थान : हस्ताक्षर

तारीख : कार्यालय अध्यक्ष

टिप्पण : यदि आवेदन अधिवर्षिता पर सेवा निवृत्ति की तारीख से तीन मास के पूर्व कार्यालय अध्यक्ष द्वारा प्राप्त कर लिया गया है तो यह अभिस्वीकृति प्ररूप से अलग करके आवेदन को सौंप दी जाएगी। यदि प्ररूप डाक से प्राप्त हुआ है तो वह उसी दिन अभिस्वीकार किया जाएगा और अभिस्वीकृति रजिस्ट्रीकृत पत्र से भेजी जाएगी। यदि यह विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख के पश्चात् प्राप्त होता है तो वह तभी स्वीकार किया जाएगा जब वह उस तारीख को या उसके पूर्व डाक में डाला गया हो और आवेदक को उस आशय का साक्ष्य प्रस्तुत करना होगा।

भाग-3

लेखा अधिकारी..... (यहां पता और पदनाम उपदर्शित करें)

को इस टिप्पणियों के साथ अग्रेषित कि :—

(1) आवेदक द्वारा भाग 1 में दी गई विशिष्टियां सत्यापित कर ली गई हैं और वे सही हैं ;

(2) आवेदक स्वास्थ्य परीक्षा के बिना अपनी पेंशन के भाग को संराशीकृत करने का पात्र है।

(3) इस समय लागू सारणी के प्रतिनिदेश से पेंशन का अवधारित संराशीकृत मूल्य.....रु० है; और

(4) संराशीकरण के पश्चात् अविशिष्ट पेंशन की रकम.....रु० होगी।

2. आवेदक के पेंशन संबंधी कागजपत्र जो सभी दृष्टियों से पूरे थे, इस मंत्रालय, विभाग/कार्यालय के पत्र संख्या.....तारीख.....के अधीन अग्रेषित कर दिए गए थे। यह अनुरोध है कि पेंशन के संराशीकृत मूल्य का संदाय पेंशन संदाय आदेश के माध्यम से प्राधिकृत किया जा सकता है जो आवेदक की सेवा निवृत्ति से एक मास पूर्व जारी किया जा सकता है।

3. इस प्ररूप के भाग-2 की प्राप्ति भाग 2 में अभिस्वीकृत कर दी गई है जिसे अलग से आवेदक को तारीख.....को अग्रेषित कर दिया गया है।

4. पेंशन का संराशीकृत मूल्य लेखा शीर्ष.....में विकलनीय है।

हस्ताक्षर.....
कार्यालय अध्यक्ष

स्थान.....
तारीख.....

[सं० 34/1/81-पेंशन एकक]

एस० आर० अहीर, उप सचिव

टिप्पण : मूल नियम, गृह मंत्रालय कार्मिक और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या 6(4)-पेंशन (ए)/79 तारीख 23-3-1981 द्वारा तैयार किए गए थे जो भारत के राजपत्र, भाग 2, खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) तारीख 11-4-1981 में कार्यालय आदेश 1134 के रूप में प्रकाशित किए गए।

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

(Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1983

S.O. 2986.—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 read with clause (5) of Article 148 of the Constitution and after consultation with the Comptroller and Auditor-General in relation to persons serving in the

Indian Audit and Accounts Department, the President hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Civil Services (Commutation of Pension) Rules, 1981. namely :—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Civil Services (Commutation of Pension) (Amendment) Rules, 1983.
- (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.
2. In the Central Civil Services (Commutation of Pension) Rules, 1981,—
 - (1) in sub-rule (2) of rule 5, after the word and figure "Form 1", the word, figure and letter "or Form 1A" shall be inserted;
 - (2) in sub-rule (1) of rule 6, after clause (i), the following clause shall be inserted, namely :—

"(ia) in sub-rule (3) of rule 13, on the date following the date of his retirement;"
 - (3) in rule 12, in the proviso, after the words and figure "Form 1", the words, figure and letter "or Form 1A" shall be inserted;
 - (4) in rule 13, after sub-rule (2), the following sub-rule shall be inserted, namely :—

"(3) A Government servant who is due to retire on superannuation and desires payment of the commuted value of pension being authorised at the time of issue of the pension payment order, shall be eligible to apply for commutation of a fraction of pension along with pension papers prior to the date of retirement provided that :—

 - (a) the Government servant retires on superannuation pension only;
 - (b) the application is submitted to the Head of Office in Form 1A, so as to reach the Head of Office not later than three months before the date of superannuation;
 - (c) no such application shall be entertained if the period is less than three months from the date of superannuation of the Government servant; and
 - (d) the Government shall have no liability for the payment of the commuted value of pension if the Government servant dies before the date of superannuation or forfeits claim to pension before such retirement."
- (5) In rule 14,—
 - (i) in sub-rule (1)—
 - (a) after the words, brackets and figures "under sub-rule (1)", the words, figures, letter and brackets "or in Form 1A of sub-rule (3)" shall be inserted;
 - (b) in clause (b) after the word and figure "Form 1", the words, figures and letter "or Form 1A" shall be inserted;
 - (c) in clause (c), after the word and figure "Form 1", the words, figure and letter "or Form 1A" shall be inserted;
- (6) in rule 15, after sub-rule (2), the following sub-rule shall be inserted, namely :—

"(3) (a) The Accounts Officer, on receipt of Form 1A from the Head of Office, shall ascertain and verify if the amount of superannuation pension of the applicant has been calculated and if not, take steps to finalise the amount of pension so that the Pension Payment Order is issued before one month of the date of retirement of the applicant.

(b) (i) The Accounts Officer, after necessary verification of the information furnished in Form 1A, shall specify in both halves of the Pension Payment Order :—

- (A) the amount of Pension commuted,
- (B) the commuted value of the amount of pension commuted.
- (C) the date from which the commuted value becomes payable.
- (ii) The Accounts Officer shall intimate to the applicant the date on which the Pension Payment Order has been despatched to the disbursing authority with the instruction that the applicant should collect the commuted value from that authority.
- (iii) The Accounts Officer, while forwarding the Pension Payment Order to the disbursing authority concerned, shall draw attention of the said authority to the proviso to sub-rule (1) of rule 6 so that the disbursing authority may make an entry in the Pension Payment Order regarding the date on which the amount of pension is to be reduced on account of commuted portion of pension.
- (iv) The Account Officer shall also request the disbursing authority to intimate the date on which the payment of the commuted value has been made to the applicant.
- (7) after Form 1, the following Forms shall be inserted, namely :—

FORM 1A

[see rules 5(2), 12, 13(3), 14(1) and 15(3)]

FORM OF APPLICATION FOR COMMUTATION OF A FRACTION OF SUPERANNUATION PENSION WITHOUT MEDICAL EXAMINATION WHEN APPLICANT DESIRES THAT THE PAYMENT OF THE COMMUTED VALUE OF PENSION SHOULD BE AUTHORISED THROUGH THE PAYMENT ORDER.

(To be submitted in duplicate at least three months before the date of retirement).

PART 1

The _____

(Here indicate the designation

and full address of the Head of Office)

Subject :—Commutation of pension without medical examination.

Sir,

I desire to commute a fraction of my pension in accordance with the provisions of the Central Civil Services (Commutation of Pension) Rules, 1981. The necessary particulars are furnished below :—

1. Name in block letters ;
2. Father's name (and also husband's name in the case of a female Government servant).
3. Designation
4. Name of Office/Deptt./Ministry in which employed.
5. Date of Birth (by Christian era).

6. Date of retirement on superannuation or on the expiry of extension in service granted under FR 56(d).

*7. Fraction of superannuation pension proposed to be commuted.

**8. Disbursing authority from which pension is to be drawn after retirement.

(a) Treasury/Sub-Treasury (Name and complete address of the Treasury/Sub-Treasury to be indicated;

(b) (i) Branch of the nominated nationalised bank with complete postal address.
(ii) Bank account No. to which monthly pension is to be credited each month.

(c) Account Office of the Ministry/Department/Office.

Signature

Present Postal Address

Place :

Date :

Postal address after retirement

Note.—The payment of commuted value of pension shall be made through the disbursing authority from which pension is to be drawn after retirement. It is not open to an applicant to draw the commuted value of pension from a disbursing authority other than the disbursing authority from which pension is to be drawn.

* The applicant should indicate the fraction of the amount of monthly pension (subject to a maximum of one-third thereof) which he/she desires to commute and not the amount in rupees.

**Score out which is not applicable.

PART II

(ACKNOWLEDGEMENT)

Received from Shri/Smt./Kumari—

Name

application in Part I of Form IA for (Designation) Commutation of a fraction of pension without medical examination.

Signature

Head of Office

Place :

Date :

Note :

If the application has been received by the Head of Office before the expiry of three months before the date of retirement on superannuation, this acknowledgement should be detached from the Form and handed over to the applicant. If the form has been received by post it has to be acknowledged on the

same day and the acknowledgement sent under registered cover to the applicant. In case it is received after the specified date, it should be accepted only if it has been put into the post on or before that date subject to the production of evidence to that effect by the applicant.

PART III

Forwarded to the Accounts Officer

(here indicate the address and designation)_____

_____with the remarks that :—

- (i) The particulars furnished by the applicant in Part I have been verified and are correct;
- (ii) the applicant is eligible to get a fraction of his pension commuted without medical examination; and
- (iii) the commuted value of pension determined with reference to the Table applicable at present comes to Rs. _____; and
- (iv) the amount of residuary pension after commutation will be Rs. _____.

2. The pension papers of the applicant completed in all respects were forwarded under this Ministry/Department/Office letter No. _____; dated _____. It is requested that the payment of commuted value of pension may be authorised through the pension payment order which may be issued one month before the retirement of the applicant.

3. The receipt of Part I of this Form has been acknowledged in Part II which has been forwarded separately to the applicant on _____.

4. The commuted value of pension is debitable to Head of Account _____.

Signature

Head of Office

Place :

Date :

Note :

The Principal Rules were introduced by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms Notification No. 6(4) Pen(A)/79 dated 23-3-1981 and published as S.O. 1134 in Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India, dated 11-4-1981.

[No. 34/1/81-Pension unit]

S. R. AHIR, Dy. Secy.

आवेश

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 2987.—दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार की सहमति से, भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का 45) की धारा 302 के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों के और उक्त अपराधों के संबंध में या उनसे संबंधित प्रयत्नों, बुद्धियों और षड्यंत्रों के तथा उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य में पुलिस थाना सिविल लाइन्स, मेरठ में रजिस्ट्रीकृत मामला अपराध सं० 152/83 के संबंध में जो जयप्रकाश शुक्ल के पुत्र महेश शुक्ल की हत्या से संबंधित है, वैसे ही तथ्यों से उत्पन्न होने वाले वैसे ही सव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए किसी अन्य अपराध के अन्वेषण

के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तारण सम्पूर्ण उत्तर प्रदेश राज्य पर करती है।

[सं. 228/12/83-ए.वी.डी.-II]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1983

S.O. 2987.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the Government of Uttar Pradesh, hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Uttar Pradesh for the investigation of offences punishable under section 302 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (45 of 1860), and attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences and any other offence committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of the same facts in regard to case Crime No. 152/83 relating to murder of Shri Mahesh Shukla S/o Jaiprakash Shukla registered at P. S. Civil Lines, Meerut, in the State of Uttar Pradesh.

[No. 228/12/83-AVD. II]

नई दिल्ली, 22 जुलाई, 1983

आदेश

का० आ० 2988—दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 6 के साथ पठित धारा 5 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजस्थान सरकार की सहमति से, भारतीय दंड संहिता, 1860 (1860 का 45) की धाराओं 147, 380, 447, 448, 454 और 427 के अधीन दंडनीय अपराधों और उक्त अपराधों के संबंध में या उनसे संबंधित प्रयत्नों, कुप्रेरणों और षडयंत्रों के और धौलपुर के भूतपूर्व शासक श्री हेमन्त द्वारा अपनी पत्नी श्री मति बसुंधरा राजे और अन्य व्यक्तियों के विरुद्ध राजस्थान के धौलपुर जिला के पुलिस थाना कोतवाली में फाइल किए गए निम्नलिखित मामलों और उसी संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किए गए अन्य अपराधों के अन्वेषण के लिए दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन के सदस्यों की शक्तियों और अधिकारिता का विस्तारण सम्पूर्ण राजस्थान राज्य में करती है।

मामलों का वर्णन

- (1) भा०द०सं० की धारा 454 के अधीन अपराध सं० 124/80 तारीख 4-6-80

- (2) भा०द०सं० की धारा 380 के अधीन अपराध सं० 140/80 तारीख 16-6-80
(3) भा०द०सं० की धारा 380 के अधीन अपराध सं० 141/80 तारीख 16-6-80
(4) भा०द०सं० की धारा 380 के अधीन अपराध सं० 91/81 तारीख 18-4-81
(5) भा०द०सं० की धारा 380 के अधीन अपराध सं० 93/81 तारीख 23-4-81
(6) भा०द०सं० की धारा 142, 447 और 427 के अधीन अपराध सं० 196/80 तारीख 2-8-80
(7) भा०द०सं० की धारा 147, 448 के अधीन 210/80 तारीख 24-8-80

[सं. 228/2/83-ए.वी.डी.-II]

एच० के० वर्मा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1983

ORDER

S.O. 2988.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 5 read with section 6 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), the Central Government with the consent of the Government of Rajasthan hereby extends the powers and jurisdiction of the members of the Delhi Special Police Establishment to the whole of the State of Rajasthan for the investigation of offences punishable under sections 147, 380, 447, 448, 454 and 427 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (45 of 1860), and attempts, abetments, and conspiracies in relation to or in connection with the said offences and any other offences committed in the course of same transaction in regard to the following cases filed at P. S. Kotwali, District Dholpur in the State of Rajasthan by Shri Hemant, former Ruler of Dholpur against his wife Smt. Vasundhara Raje and others.

Description of the cases.

- (i) Crime No. 124/80 dated 4-6-80 under section 454 IPC.
(ii) Crime No. 140/80 dated 16-6-80 under section 380 IPC.
(iii) Crime No. 141/80 dated 16-6-80 under section 380 IPC.
(iv) Crime No. 91/81 dated 18-4-81 under section 380 IPC.
(v) Crime No. 93/21 dated 23-4-81 under section 380 IPC.
(vi) Crime No. 196/80 dated 2-8-80 under Sections 147, 447 and 427 IPC.
(vii) Crime No. 210/80 dated 24-8-80 under sections 147 and 448 IPC.

[No. 228/2/83-AVD.II]

H. K. VERMA, Under Secy.

वित्त मंत्रालय

राजस्व विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1983

(आयकर)

का० प्रा० 2989.—इस कार्यालय की दिनांक 28-2-80 की अधिसूचना सं० 3196 (फा० सं० 203/37/1980-आ० क० नि०-2) के सिलसिले में सर्वसाधारण की जानकारी के लिए एतद्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विहित प्राधिकारी अर्थात् विज्ञान और प्रौद्योगिकी विभाग नई दिल्ली ने निम्नलिखित संस्था को आयकर नियम 1962 के नियम 6 के साथ पठित आयकर अधिनियम 1961 की धारा 35 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (2) के प्रयोजनों के लिए अन्य प्राकृतिक तथा अनुप्रयुक्त विज्ञानों के क्षेत्र में "संगण" प्रवर्ग के अधीन निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर अनुमोदित किया है अर्थात् :-

1. यह कि मंगलोर मेडिकल रिलीफ सोसाइटी, मंगलोर वैज्ञानिक अनुसन्धान के लिए उसके द्वारा प्राप्त राशियों का पृथक लेखा रखेगा।

2. यह कि उक्त संस्था अपने वैज्ञानिक अनुसन्धान संबंधी क्रियाकलापों की वार्षिक विवरणी विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रत्येक वित्तीय वर्ष के संबंध में प्रति वर्ष 30 अप्रैल तक ऐसे प्ररूप में प्रस्तुत करेगी जो इस प्रयोजन के लिए अधिकथित किया जाए और उसे सूचित किया जाए।

3. यह कि उक्त संस्था अपनी कुल आय तथा व्यय दर्शाते हुए अपने संपरीक्षित वार्षिक लेखों की तथा अपनी परिसंपत्तियां, देनदारियां दर्शाते हुए तुलन-पत्र की एक-एक प्रति प्रतिवर्ष विहित प्राधिकारी को प्रस्तुत करेगी तथा इन दस्तावेजों में से प्रत्येक की एक-एक प्रति संबंधित आयकर के आयुक्त को भेजेगा।

संस्था

मंगलोर मेडिकल रिलीफ सोसाइटी, मंगलोर

यह अधिसूचना 27-12-82 से 31-12-83 तक की अवधि के लिए प्रभावी है।

[सं० 5309/फा० सं० 203/84/83-आ० क० नि० II]

एम० जी० सी० गोयल, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1983

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 2989.—In continuation of this office Notification No. 3196 (F. No. 203/37/1980-II(AII)) dated 28-2-80, it is hereby notified for general information that the institution mentioned below has been approved by Department of Science & Technology, New Delhi, the prescribed authority for the purposes of clause (ii) of Sub-section (1) of section 35 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 read with Rule 6 of the Income-tax Rules, 1962 under the Category "Institution" in the area

of other natural and applied sciences subject to the following conditions:—

(i) That the Mangalore Medical Relief Society, Mangalore will maintain a separate account of the sums received by it for scientific research.

(ii) That the said Institution will furnish annual returns of its scientific research activities to the Prescribed Authority for every financial year in such forms as may be laid down and intimated to them for this purpose by 30th April each year.

(iii) That the said Institution will submit to the Prescribed Authority by 30th June each year a copy of their audited annual accounts showing their total income and expenditure and balance sheet showing its assets, liabilities with a copy of each of these documents to the concerned Commissioner of Income-tax.

INSTITUTION

Mangalore Medical Relief Society, Mangalore

This notification is effective for a period from 27-12-82 to 31-12-1983.

[No. 5309/F. No. 203/84/83/ITA.II]

M. G. C. GOYAL, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1983

(आय-कर)

का० प्रा० 2990.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (23ग) के खंड (5) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा "सर्विसेज एसोसिएशन आफ सेवन्थ-डे एडवेंटिस्ट प्राइवेट लिमिटेड" को उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ कर-निर्धारण वर्ष 1979-80 से 1982-83 तक के अन्तर्गत आने वाली अवधि के लिये, अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 5311/फा० सं० 197/180/79-आई०टी० (ए०आई०)]

बी० बी० श्रीनिवासन, निदेशक.

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1983

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 2990.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (v) of sub-section (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies "Services Association of Seventh-day Adventist Private Limited" for the purpose of the said section for the period covered by the assessment years 1979-80 to 1982-83.

[No. 5311/F. No. 197/180/79-IT(AI)]

V. B. SRINIVASAN, Director

केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क और सीमा-शुल्क बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 1983

सं० 217/83-सीमा-शुल्क

का० आ० 2991.—केन्द्रीय सरकार उत्पाद-शुल्क और सीमाशुल्क बोर्ड, सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए महाराष्ट्र राज्य में जलगांव जिले और तालुक में निमखेड़ी गांव को भाण्डागार स्टेशन के रूप में घोषित करता है।

[फा० सं० 473/96/83-सी० शु०-7]

CENTRAL BOARD OF EXCISE AND CUSTOMS

New Delhi, the 30th July, 1983

No. 217/83-CUSTOMS

S.O. 2991.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares Nimkhedi Village in Taluka and District Jalgaon in the State of Maharashtra to be a warehousing station.

[F. No. 473/96/83-Cus.VII]

सं० 218/83-सीमा-शुल्क

का०आ० 2992.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क और सीमा शुल्क बोर्ड, सीमाशुल्क अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 9 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उड़ीसा राज्य में बयोंझार जिले के बामदीपान गांव की भाण्डागार स्टेशन के रूप में घोषित करना है।

[फा०सं० 473/115/83-सी०शु०-7]

आनन्द छाबड़ा, सचिव
केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क और सीमाशुल्क बोर्ड

No. 218/83-CUSTOMS

S.O. 2992.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 9 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962), the Central Board of Excise and Customs hereby declares village Bamnipal of Keonjhar District, in the State of Orissa, to be a warehousing station.

[F. No. 473/115/83-Cus. VII]

A. K. CHHABRA, Secy.

Central Board of Excise & Customs

(आर्थिक कार्य विभाग)

(स्टाक एक्सचेंज प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 2993.—प्रतिभूति संविदा विनियमन अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 42) की धारा 28 की उपधारा (2) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार इस बात से संतुष्ट होने हुए, कि देश के आर्थिक विकास के हित में ऐसा करना आवश्यक है, औद्योगिक परियोजनाओं के वित्तपोषण के लिए, किसी राज्य सरकार के किसी विकास अथवा निवेश अभिकरण द्वारा शेयरों के क्रय अथवा विक्रय के लिए अथवा उससे संबंधित कार्यों के अनुसरण में निष्पन्न किए गए संविदाओं को, ऐसे संविदाओं के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है, जिन पर प्रतिभूति संविदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1956 लागू नहीं होगा।

[संख्या एफ० 1/42/एस ई/82]

नीतीश सेनगुप्त, संयुक्त सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Stock Exchange Division)

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1983

S.O. 2993.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 28 of the Securities Contracts (Regu-
462 GI/83—2

lation) Act, 1956 (42 of 1956), the Central Government, being satisfied that in the interest of the economic development of the country it is necessary so to do, hereby specifies the contracts, in accordance with the agreements for or relating to the purchase or sale of shares, entered into by any developmental or investment agency of a State Government for financing industrial projects, as the contracts to which the Securities Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1956, shall not apply.

[No. F. 1/42/SE/82]

N. K. SENGUPTA, Jt. Secy.

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 2994.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-ख की उप धारा (1) और (2) के उपबन्ध धनलक्ष्मी बैंक लिमिटेड, त्रिचूर पर, 4 जुलाई, 1983 से 3 अक्टूबर, 1983 तक 3 महीने के लिए अथवा उक्त बैंक में अगले पूर्ण-कालिक अध्यक्ष की नियुक्ति होने तक, इनमें से जो भी पहले हो, लागू नहीं होंगे।

[सं० 15/2/283-बी० ओ०-III]

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 2994.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendations of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that provisions of sub-section (1) and (2) of Section 10B of the said Act, shall not apply to the Dhanalakshmi Bank Ltd., Trichur, for 3 months from 4th July, 1983 to 3rd October, 1983 or till the appointment of the next whole-time Chairman of that Bank, whichever is earlier.

[No. 15/22/83-B.O.III]

नयी दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 2995.—बैंककारी विनियमन अधिनियम, 1949 (1949 का 10) की धारा 53 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक की सिफारिश पर एतद्वारा घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 31 के उपबन्ध बैंक आफ कोचीन लि०, पर 31 अगस्त, 1983 तक उस सीमा तक लागू नहीं होंगे जहां तक उनका सम्बन्ध उसके द्वारा निर्धारित रूप में लेखा परीक्षकों की रिपोर्ट के साथ लेखाओं और तुलन पत्रों का प्रकाशन करने तथा 30 जून, 1983 तक की बढ़ाई गई अवधि के भीतर रिजर्व बैंक को इन विवरणियों की तीन प्रतियां प्रस्तुत करने से है।

[सं० 15/21/83-बी० ओ०-III]

एन० डी० बत्रा, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1983

S.O. 2995.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of Section 31 of the said Act shall not apply to the Bank of Cochin Ltd., upto 31st August, 1983 in so far as it is required to publish the accounts and balance sheet together with the auditor's report in the prescribed manner and submit three copies thereof as returns to the Reserve Bank within the extended period upto 30th June, 1983.

[No. 15/21/83-B.O.III]

N. D. BATRA, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 5 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 2996.—भारतीय निर्यात-आयात बैंक अधिनियम, 1981 (1981 का 28) की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (ड) के उपखण्ड (1) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा श्री आर० भण्डारी, सचिव (ई० आर०) विदेश मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली को 5 जुलाई, 1983 से भारतीय निर्यात-आयात बैंक के निदेशक मण्डल में निदेशक के रूप में मनोनीत करती है।

[संख्या 9/30/83-बी०ओ०]

New Delhi, the 5th July, 1983

S.O. 2996.—In pursuance of sub-clause (i) of clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of Export-Import Bank of India Act, 1981 (28 of 1981), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri R. Bhandari, Secretary (ER), Ministry of External Affairs, New Delhi as a Director of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of India with effect from 5th July, 1983.

[No. F. 9/30/82-BO. I]

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 2997.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 8 के उपखंड (1) के साथ पठित खंड 3 के उपखंड (क) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, श्री एस० पी० सेनगुप्ता को 19 जुलाई, 1983 से आरम्भ होने वाली और 18 जुलाई, 1986 को समाप्त होने वाली अवधि के लिए यूनाइटेड कर्माशियल बैंक के प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एफ० 9/17/83-बी०ओ०-I(1)]

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1983

S.O. 2997.—In pursuance of sub-clause (a) of clause 3 read with sub-clause (1) of clause 8 of the Nationalised

Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri S. P. Sen Gupta as the Managing Director of the United Commercial Bank for a period commencing on 19th July, 1983 and ending with 18th July, 1986.

[No. F. 9/17/83-BO.I(1)]

का० आ० 2998.—राष्ट्रीयकृत बैंक (प्रबंध और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 7 के साथ पठित खण्ड 5 के उपखण्ड (1) के अनुसरण में, केन्द्रीय सरकार, भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, श्री एस० पी० सेनगुप्ता को, जिन्हें 19 जुलाई, 1983 से यूनाइटेड कर्माशियल बैंक के प्रबंध निदेशक के रूप में नियुक्त किया गया है, उसी तारीख से यूनाइटेड कर्माशियल बैंक के निदेशक बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[सं० एफ० 9/17/83-बी०ओ०-I(2)]

च० वा० मीरचन्दानी, उप सचिव।

S.O. 2998.—In pursuance of sub-clause (1) of clause 5, read with clause 7 of the Nationalised Banks (Management and Miscellaneous Provisions) Scheme, 1970, the Central Government, after consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby appoints Shri S. P. Sen Gupta, who has been appointed as Managing Director of the United Commercial Bank with effect from 19th July, 1983 to be the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the United Commercial Bank with effect from the same date.

[No. F. 9/17/83-BO.I(2)]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Dy. Secy.

वाणिज्य मंत्रालय

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 30 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 2999.—भारत के निर्यात व्यापार के विकास के लिए सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण करने के लिए 'कतिपय प्रस्ताव निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 के उप नियम (2) की अपेक्षानुसार भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय के आदेश सं० का०आ० 1115 तारीख 19 फरवरी, 1983 के अधीन भारत के राजपत्र भाग-II, खंड-3, उपखंड (ii) तारीख 19 फरवरी, 1983 में प्रकाशित किए गए थे।

और राजपत्र में उक्त आदेश के प्रकाशन से पैंतालीस दिन के भीतर उनमें प्रभावित होने वाले सभी व्यक्तियों से आक्षेप तथा सुझाव मांगे गए थे ;

और उक्त राजपत्र की प्रतियां जनता को 3-3-1983 को उपलब्ध करा दी गयी थीं ;

उक्त प्रारूप के प्रस्तावों पर जनता से प्राप्त आक्षेपों और सुझावों पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने विचार कर लिया है ;

अतः अब, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 6 द्वारा

प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार की निर्यात निरीक्षण परिपद से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् यह राय होने पर कि भारत के निर्यात व्यापार के विकास के लिए ऐसा करना आवश्यक तथा समीचीन है, इसके द्वारा—

(1) अधिसूचित करती है कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात से पूर्व निरीक्षण किया जाएगा;

(2) सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1983 के अनुसार निरीक्षण के प्रकार को, निरीक्षण के ऐसे प्रकार के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है जो ऐसी सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों पर उनके निर्यात से पूर्व लागू होगा।

(3) (क) सुसंगत भारतीय मानकों या अन्य राष्ट्रीय मानकों को;

(ख) इस बात के अधीन रहते हुए कि उत्पाद इस आदेश के उपाबंध में विनिर्दिष्ट न्यूनतम विशेषताओं की पूर्ति करता है संविदात्मक विनिर्देशों को; तथा

(ग) निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा निर्यातकर्ता तथा विदेशी क्रेता के बीच निर्यात संविदा के स्वीकृत विनिर्देशों के रूप में घोषित ऐसे विनिर्देशों को, ऐसी निर्यात संविदाओं के लिए जो इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से पूर्व पुष्ट हो गई हैं तथा जिनका उस तारीख से साठ दिन की अवधि के भीतर निर्यात कर दिया गया है; सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के लिए मानक विनिर्देशों के रूप में मान्यता देती है।

टिप्पण :—जब निर्यात संविदा पूर्ण तकनीकी आवश्यकताओं को निर्दिष्ट नहीं करती है या केवल नमूनों पर आधारित है तब निर्यातकर्ता को लिखित रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रस्तुत करना होगा।

(4) अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय व्यापार के दौरान ऐसी सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के निर्यात को तब तक प्रतिषिद्ध करना जब तक कि उसके साथ निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित निर्यात निरीक्षण अधिकरणों द्वारा जारी किया गया इस आदेश का प्रमाण-पत्र न हो कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलें पूर्वोक्त मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप हैं और निर्यात योग्य हैं।

2. इस आदेश की कोई भी बात—

(क) भावी क्रेताओं को भू-मार्ग, समुद्र मार्ग या वायु मार्ग द्वारा सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के वास्तविक नमूनों के निर्यात को लागू नहीं होगी जिनका पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य 500 रुपये से अधिक नहीं है।

(ख) सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के उन परेषणों के निर्यात को लागू नहीं होगी जो इस आदेश के राज-

पत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से पहले ही विनिर्माता या निर्यातकर्ता के परिसर से जा चुके हैं।

3. इस आदेश में “सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों” से ऐसी टाइलें अभिप्रेत हैं जो सामान्य पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट या जल्दी कड़ा होने वाला पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट, सीमेंट बनाने के लिए तोड़े हुए प्राकृतिक पत्थर और रंगीन सामग्री जहां आवश्यक हों, दाब प्रक्रिया द्वारा विनिर्मित हैं और इनके अन्तर्गत—

(क) साधारण सीमेंट की टाइलें अर्थात् वे टाइलें जिनके विनिर्माण में सतह पर किसी प्रकार के वर्णक और स्टोन चिप्स का प्रयोग नहीं किया जाता है;

(ख) साधारण रंगीन टाइलें अर्थात् वे टाइलें जिनमें साधारण सतह पर स्टोन चिप्स रहित वर्णकों का प्रयोग किया जाता है;

(ग) टैराजों टाइलें अर्थात् वे टाइलें जिनकी घिसने वाली सतह वर्णकों रहित या सहित से मिश्रित पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट के मैट्रिक्स में स्टोन चिप्स से बनाई गई है, किन्तु इसके अन्तर्गत रंग-विरंगी और पूर्ण निमित्त टाइलें नहीं हैं।

4. यह आदेश राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होगा।

उपाबंध

सीमेंट कंकरीट फर्श की टाइलों के लिए निर्दिष्ट विशेषताओं की न्यूनतम अपेक्षाएं।

1. संरचना—सीमेंट कंकरीट फर्श की टाइलें, पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट के मिश्रण, प्राकृतिक योगों और जहां भी आवश्यक हो वहां रंगीन सामग्री के मिश्रण, दाब प्रक्रिया द्वारा निमित्त की जाएंगी। अग्रभाग/घिसाई की परत संपूर्ण अच्छी क्वालिटी संगमरमर की होगी या पर्याप्त कठोरता वाले प्राकृतिक पत्थर की होगी जब कि आधारित परत के लिए पूर्ण सामग्री प्राकृतिक पदार्थों जैसे पिसी या बिना पिसी बजरी या प्राकृतिक रेत के साथ पिसे पत्थर, पिसे रेत के पत्थर या पिसी बजरी होगी।

2. फिनिश—जब तक कि अन्यथा विनिर्दिष्ट न हो, सभी टाइलों की सतह, चपटी और चिकनी बहिर्वेशन अवनमन आकुंचन से मुक्त होगी। किनारों और फिटिंग्स की सतह चपटी और आकुंचन से मुक्त होगी। सभी किनारे तेज तथा तीव्र होंगे।

3. विभाण—टाइलों का आकार न्यूनतम कुल 20 मिली मीटर की मोटाई के अधीन रहते हुए, क्रेता और विक्रेता के बीच तय पाए कथार के अनुसार होगा।

4. सह्यताएं—(1) टाइलों की लंबाई या चौड़ाई पर सह्यता \pm मिली मीटर होगी। इसके अतिरिक्त नमूने में सबसे लंबे और सबसे छोटे किनारों के बीच की साइड की लंबाई में अंतर 1 मिलीमीटर से अधिक नहीं होता।

(2) मोटाई पर सहता + 5 मिलीमीटर होगी। इसके अतिरिक्त नमूने में सबसे मोटी और सबसे पतली टाइल्स के बीच की मोटाई में अंतर 3 मिलीमीटर से अधिक नहीं होना चाहिए।

5. घिसाई परत की मोटाई—सीमेंट कंकरीट फर्श की टाइलों की विभिन्न श्रेणियों के लिए घिसाई परत की न्यूनतम मोटाई नीचे दी गयी सारणी के अनुसार होगी:

सारणी	
क्रम सं०	टाइल्स की श्रेणियां
	छिजोर वाली परत की कम से कम मोटाई (मि० मि०)
(i)	सामान्य प्रयोग के लिए साधारण सीमेंट और साधारण रंगीन टाइलें
(ii)	सामान्य प्रयोग के लिए चिप्स सहित टैराज टाइलें जिसका आकार छोटे से लेकर 6 मि० मि० तक का होगा।
(iii)	सामान्य उद्देश्य के लिए, चिप्स सहित टैराज टाइलें जिनका छोटे से छोटा चिप्स 12 मि० मि० होगा।
(iv)	सामान्य उद्देश्य के लिए चिप्स सहित टैराज टाइलें जिनका छोटे से छोटा चिप्स 20 मि० मि० होगा।
(v)	भारी शुल्क के लिए साधारण टाइल्स और साधारण रंगीन टाइलें

टिप्पण: टाइल की जो विभजक रेखा गीली अनुप्रस्थ क्षमता के लिए परीक्षित की गयी थी उसके साथ घिसने वाली सतह की मोटाई विभिन्न बिन्दुओं पर नापी जाएगी। दो नापों का अंक गणितीय माध्य जो निम्नतम मूल्य दर्शाता हो, वह घिसने वाली सतह की न्यूनतम मोटाई होगी।

6. अग्रभाग-घिसने वाली सतह के चिप्सों का रंग, डिजाइन और आकार—टाइलों के सामने और घिसने वाली परत के रंग, डिजाइन और आकार क्रेता और विक्रेता के बीच हुए करार के अनुसार या अनुमोदित नमूनों के अनुसार होगा।

7. जल अवशोषकता—जल अवशोषकता की औसत प्रतिशतता 10 से अधिक नहीं होगी।

8. आद्र अनुप्रस्थ क्षमता—औसत आद्र अनुप्रस्थ क्षमता किलोग्राम एफ/सेटीमीटर² से कम नहीं होगी।

टिप्पण—टैराजों, टाइलों का निर्यात क्रेता की इच्छानुसार नीचे दी गई तीन श्रेणियों में से किसी एक के अन्तर्गत

किया जा सकता है, अर्थात्: (क) तलछटी, (ख) अर्ध-पॉलिश किए हुए, (ग) पूर्ण पॉलिश किए हुए, (आक्सजैलिक अम्ल की क्रॉटिंग से न कि मोम की क्रॉटिंग से पूर्ण फिनिश सहित) जब कि साधारण टाइलें: (क) बिना पॉलिश की हुई या, (ख) अर्ध-पॉलिश की हुई, या (ग) पूर्णतया पॉलिश करके नयाय की जा सकती हैं।

[सं० 6(15) 80-ई० आई० एण्ड ई० पी०]

सी० बी० कुबरेता, संयुक्त निदेशक

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

ORDER

New Delhi, the 30th July, 1983

S.O.2999.—Whereas for the development of the export trade of India certain proposals for subjecting cement concrete flooring tiles to inspection prior to export were published as required by sub-rule (2) of rule 11 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Rules, 1964, in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-section (ii) dated the 19th February, 1983, under the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. S.O. 1115 dated the 19th February 1983;

And whereas the objections and suggestions were invited from all persons likely to be affected thereby within 45 days of the publication of the said Order in the Official Gazette;

And whereas the copies of the said Gazette were made available to the public on the 3-3-1983;

And whereas the objections and suggestions received from the public on the said draft proposals have been considered by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government, after consultation with the Export Inspection Council, being of opinion that it is necessary and expedient so to do for the development of the export trade of India, hereby:—

- (1) notifies that cement concrete flooring tiles shall be subject to inspection prior to export;
- (2) specifies the type of inspection in accordance with the Export of Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles (Inspection) Rules, 1983, as the type of inspection which shall be applied to such cement concrete flooring tiles prior to their export;
- (3); recognises:—
 - (a) the relevant Indian Standard or any other National Standards;
 - (b) contractual specification subject to the product satisfying the minimum of the characteristics specified in the Annexure to this order; and
 - (c) the specifications declared by the exporter to be the agreed specification of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, for such export contracts as are confirmed prior to the date of publication of the Order in the Official Gazette and exporter within a period of sixty days from that date;

as the standard specifications for cement concrete flooring tiles.

Note:—When the export contract does not indicate detailed technical requirements or based only on samples, the exporter should furnish a written down specification.

- (4) prohibits the export in the course of international trade of cement concrete flooring tiles, unless the same are accompanied by a certificate, issued by any of the Export Inspection agencies established under section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), to the effect that the cement concrete flooring tiles conforms to any of the aforesaid standard specifications and are exportworthy.

2. Nothing in this order shall apply to the export of—

- (a) bonafide samples of cement concrete flooring tiles not exceeding Rs. 500 only in Free-on-Board value to the prospective buyer by land, sea or air ;
- (b) consignments of cement concrete flooring tiles which might have already left the premises of the exporter or manufacturer immediately prior to the date of publication of this order in the Official Gazette.

3. In this Order "Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles" shall mean tiles manufactured by pressure process from a mixture of ordinary portland cement or rapid hardening portland cement, natural aggregates and colouring material where required and includes :—

- (a) plain cement tiles, that is to say, tiles in the manufacture of which no pigments and stone chips are used in the wearing surface;
- (b) plain coloured tiles, that is to say, tiles having a plain wearing surface wherein pigments are used but without stone chips ;
- (c) terrazo tiles, that is to say, tiles whose wearing surface is composed of stone chips in matrix of portland cement mixed with or without pigments, but does not include chequered tiles and precast tiles.

4. This order shall come into force on the date of its publication in the official gazette.

ANNEXURE

Minimum requirements of the specified characteristics for cement concrete flooring tiles

1. Construction.—Cement concrete Flooring Tiles shall be manufactured from a mixture of portland cement, natural aggregates, and colouring material were required, by pressure process. In the facing/wearing layer the aggregates shall consist of good quality marble or other natural stone of similar characteristics of adequate hardness. While for the base layer the aggregates shall consist of naturally occurring material such as crushed or uncrushed gravel or crushed stone, with natural sand, crushed stone sand or crushed gravel sand.

2. Finish.—Unless otherwise specified, the surface of all tiles shall be smooth and plane, free from projections, depressions and crazing skirtings and fittings shall have smooth surface free from crazing. All edges shall be sharp and tone.

3. Dimensions.—The size of tiles shall be as per agreement between the buyer and the seller subject to a minimum total thickness of 20 mm.

4. Tolerances—(1) Tolerances on length or breadth of tiles shall be ± 1 mm. In addition, the differences in length of side between the longest side and the shorter side in the sample shall not exceed 1 mm.

(2) Tolerances on thickness shall be ± 5 mm. In addition the differences in thickness between the thickness and the thinnest tile in the sample shall not exceed 3 mm.

5. Thickness of wearing layer—The minimum thickness of wearing layer for the various classes of cement concrete flooring tiles shall be as per Table given below.

TABLE

Sl. No.	Class of tiles	Minimum thickness of wearing layer (mm)
1	2	3
(i)	Plain cement and plain coloured tiles, for general purpose.	5
(ii)	Terrazo tiles with chips of size varying from the smallest upto 6 mm, for general purpose.	5
(iii)	Terrazo tiles with chips of size varying from the smallest upto 12 mm, for general purpose.	6
(iv)	Terrazo tiles with chips of size varying from the smallest upto 20 mm, for general purpose.	6
(v)	Plain cement and plain coloured tiles, for heavy duty.	6

Note:—The thickness of the wearing layer shall be measured at several points along the fracture line of the tile that was tested for wet transverse strength. The arithmetic mean of the two measurements which yield the lowest value shall be the minimum thickness of wearing layer.

6. Colour, design and size of chips in the facing/wearing layer—The colour, design and size of chips in the facing/wearing layer of the tiles shall be as agreed between the buyer and the exporter or as per approved sample(s).

7. Water absorption—The average percentage of water absorption shall not exceed 10.

8. Wet transverse strength—The average wet transverse strength shall not less than 30 Kgf/cm².

NOTE :—Terrazo tiles shall be exported under anyone of the three categories as desired by the buyer, namely (a) grouted, (b) Semipolished, (c) Fully-polished (with smooth finished with oxalic acid coat but not wax coated), while plain tiles could be supplied as (a) Unpolished or (b) Semi-polished or (c) Fully-polished.

IF. No 6(15)/80-El&EPJ

का० प्र० 3000.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्यालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 17 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अर्थात्—

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम 'सीमेंट कंक्रीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात (निरीक्षण) नियम, 1983' है।

(2) ये राजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. परिभाषाएँ—इन नियमों में, जब तक कि संदर्भ से अन्यथा अपेक्षित न हो,—

- (क) “अधिनियम” से नियमित (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) अभिप्रेत है;
- (ख) “अभिकरण” से अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन स्थापित नियमित निरीक्षण अभिकरणों में से कोई एक अभिकरण अभिप्रेत है;
- (ग) “परिषद्” से अधिनियम की धारा 3 के अधीन स्थापित नियमित निरीक्षण परिषद् अभिप्रेत है;
- (घ) “सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों” से ऐसी टाइलें अभिप्रेत हैं जो सामान्य पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट या जल्दी कड़ा होने वाले पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट, सीमेंट बनाने के लिए तोड़े हुए प्राकृतिक पत्थर और रंगीन सामग्री, जहाँ अपेक्षित हो, दाब प्रक्रिया द्वारा विनिर्मित हैं और इनके अन्तर्गत—
- (i) साधारण सीमेंट की टाइलें, अर्थात् जिनके विनिर्माण में सतह पर किसी प्रकार के वर्णक तथा स्टोन चिप्स का प्रयोग नहीं किया जाता है;
- (ii) साधारण रंगीन टाइलें, अर्थात्, जिनकी साधारण सतह होती है और जिसमें स्टोन चिप्स रहित वर्णकों का प्रयोग किया जाता है;
- (iii) टेराज टाइलें, अर्थात् जिनकी सतह वर्णकों रहित या सहित मिश्रित पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट के मैट्रिक्स में स्टोन चिप्स से बनाई गई हैं, परन्तु इनके अन्तर्गत रंग-बिरंगी और पूर्ण निमित्त टाइलें नहीं होती हैं।
- (ङ) “अनुसूची” से इन नियमों से संलग्न अनुसूची अभिप्रेत है।

3. निरीक्षण का आधार—सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निरीक्षण यह देखने के विचार से किया जाएगा कि निर्यात के लिए आशयित सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों का परेक्षण अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा मान्यता प्राप्त मानक विनिर्देशों के अनुरूप है; अर्थात्:—

- (क) सुसंगत भारतीय मानक या अन्य कोई राष्ट्रीय मानक,
- (ख) अधिनियम की धारा 6 के अधीन आदेश के उपा-बंध में निर्दिष्ट न्यूनतम विशेषताओं की पूर्ति करती हुए, उत्पाद के अधीन संविदात्मक विनिर्देश, और अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट परीक्षण की प्रणाली या नमूना लेने के मानदंड को अपनाते हुए, उत्पादों के निरीक्षण और परीक्षण के आधार पर इस बात के अधीन होते हुए और (ग) निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा निर्यातकर्ता और विदेशी क्रेता के बीच निर्यात संविदा के स्वीकृत विनिर्देशों के रूप में घोषित

विनिर्देशों को ऐसी निर्यात संविदाओं के लिए जो राजपत्र में इस आदेश के प्रकाशन की तारीख से पूर्व पुष्ट हो गए हैं तथा जिसका उस तारीख से साठ दिन की अवधि के भीतर निर्यात कर दिया गया है।

4. निरीक्षण की प्रक्रिया—(1) सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों को निर्यात करने का इच्छुक निर्यातकर्ता अपने ऐसा करने के आशय की सूचना लिखित रूप में संबंधित निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण को देगा और ऐसी सूचना के साथ निर्यात संविदा या आदेश की एक प्रति अभिकरण के निकटतम कार्यालय को देगा ताकि वह नियम 3 के अनुसार निरीक्षण कर सके।

(2) उप-नियम (1) के अधीन प्रत्येक सूचना पोत-लदान की प्रत्याशित तारीख से कम से कम 7 (सात) दिन पहले दी जाएगी।

(3) उप-नियम (2) के अधीन सूचना प्राप्त होने पर अभिकरण नियम 3 और परिषद् द्वारा समय-समय पर जारी किए गए निर्देशों के अनुसार निरीक्षण करेगा।

(4) यदि, निरीक्षण के पश्चात् अभिकरण का यह समाधान हो जाता है कि सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों के निर्यात किए जाने वाला परेक्षण नियम 3 की अपेक्षाओं के अनुरूप है तो वह उप-नियम (2) के अधीन सूचना प्राप्त होने के सात दिन के भीतर यह घोषणा करते हुए, कि परेक्षण निर्यात योग्य है, निर्यातकर्ता को प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करेगा;

परन्तु जहाँ अभिकरण का इस प्रकार का समाधान नहीं होता है वहाँ वह सात दिन की उक्त अवधि के भीतर ऐसा प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने से इंकार कर देगा और ऐसे इंकार की सूचना उसके कारणों सहित निर्यातकर्ता को देगा।

5. निरीक्षण का स्थान—इन नियमों के अधीन प्रत्येक निरीक्षण या तो विनिर्माता के परिसरों पर किया जाएगा या उन परिसरों पर किया जाएगा जहाँ निर्यातकर्ता द्वारा माल प्रस्तुत किया जाता है परन्तु यह तब जब कि यहाँ इस प्रयोजन के लिए पर्याप्त सुविधाएं विद्यमान हैं।

6. निरीक्षण फीस—प्रत्येक परेक्षण के लिए कम से कम 20/- रुपये के अधीन रहते हुए, ऐसे प्रत्येक परेक्षण के लिए पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के प्रत्येक एक सौ रुपये के लिए चालीस पैसे की दर से फीस निरीक्षण फीस के रूप में दी जाएगी सिवाय विनिर्माता निर्यातकर्ताओं की दशा में जो संबंध राज्य सरकार या संघ राज्य-क्षेत्रों में संघविनिर्माण एककों के रूप में रजिस्ट्रीकृत हैं और ऐसे विनिर्माता तथा निर्यातकर्ता प्रति परेक्षण कम से कम 20/- रुपये के अधीन रहते हुए, पोत पर्यन्त निःशुल्क मूल्य के प्रति एक सौ रुपये के लिए छत्तीस पैसे की दर से निरीक्षण फीस देंगे।

7. अपील—(1) निरीक्षण अभिकरण द्वारा नियम 4 के उपनियम (4) के अधीन प्रमाण-पत्र जारी करने के इन्कार किए जाने से व्यथित कोई व्यक्ति, ऐसे इन्कार की सूचना प्राप्त होने के दस दिन के भीतर कम से कम तीन और अधिक से अधिक सात व्यक्तियों से गठित विशेषज्ञों के पैनल का जो केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा इस प्रयोजन के लिए नियुक्त किया जाए, अपील कर सकेगा।

(2) विशेषज्ञों के पैनल की कुल सदस्यता के कम से कम दो तिहाई सदस्य गैर सरकारी होंगे।

(3) पैनल की गणपूर्ति तीन से होगी।

(4) अपील प्राप्त होने के पन्द्रह दिन के भीतर निपटा दी जाएगी।

अनुसूची

(नियम 3 देखिए)

1. नमूना लेने के लिए मापमान—नमूना लेने के लिए मापमान के संबंध में संविदात्मक विनिर्देशों में विशिष्ट अनुबन्ध के न होने पर नीचे अधिष्ठित अनुबन्ध लागू होंगे:—

(1) एक परीक्षण में एक ही प्रकार, श्रेणी, आकार की सीमेंट कंकरीट की फर्श की टाइलों से एक लाट गठित होगा। प्रत्येक विशिष्टता के लिए एक लाट में चुनी गयी नमूना टाइलों की संख्या नीचे दी गयी सारणी के अनुसार होगी:—

सारणी

लाट आकार	नमूना टाइलों की संख्या	तुष्टिपूर्ण की अनुदेय संख्या (स्वीकृत संख्या)
1	2	3
150 तक	3	0
151 से 500 तक	5	0
501 से 3000 तक	8	0
3001 से 10,000 तक	10	0
10,000 से 35,000 तक	13	1
35,000 से 1,00,000	20	2
1,00,001 और अधिक	32	3

टिप्पण:—एक विशिष्टता के लिए उपरोक्त सारणी के अनुसार चुनी गयी टाइलों, उसके लिए अपेक्षाओं के सत्यापन के पश्चात् अगली विशिष्टता के लिए और इसी प्रकार और विशिष्टताओं के लिए प्रयुक्त की जा सकेगी। तथापि, नकारात्मक परीक्षण जैसी गीली अनुप्रस्थ क्षमता के लिए, जल अवशोषणता आदि के लिए पृथक् से नमूने लिए जाएंगे। घिसने वाली सतह की मोटाई अनेक केन्द्रों पर टाइल की इस विभाग रेखा के साथ

नापी जाएगी जिसका परीक्षण गीली अनुप्रस्थ क्षमता के लिए किया गया था। कुल मोटाई के लिए टाइल की निचली ओर पर खाँचों के भाग के नाम से भिन्न केन्द्रों पर रीडिंग ली जाएंगी।

2. पुनः परीक्षण—यदि उपमद (1) के नीचे सारणी के अनुसार चुना गया नमूना परीक्षण अपेक्षाओं को पूर्णतः या अंशतः पूरा नहीं करता है तो यदि निर्यातकर्ता ऐसा चाहे तो नीचे दी गयी सारणी के अनुसार एक नया नमूना उसी परीक्षण में से लिया जाएगा और उसका परीक्षण किया जाएगा।

सारणी

लाट आकार	नमूना टाइलों की संख्या	अनुदेय की संख्या (अनुमोदित संख्या)
1	2	3
150 तक	6	0
151 से 500 तक	10	1
501 से 3000 तक	16	3
3001 से 10,000 तक	20	3
10,000 से 35,000 तक	26	4
35,001 से 1,00,000 तक	40	6
1,00,001 और अधिक	64	8

टिप्पण:—यदि निर्यातकर्ता चाहे तो, बेरी से वजन के लिए प्रथम निरीक्षण के समय ही नमूनों का द्वितीय सेट भी लिया जा सकेगा।

2. अनुप्रस्थता का मापदंड—यदि निर्यात संविदा में अन्यथा विनिर्दिष्ट नहीं है तो किए गए परीक्षणों की अनुरूपता के मापदंड सुसंगत भारतीय मानक विनिर्देश के अनुसार होंगे अर्थात् समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित आई एस 1237—1980 का अनुसरण किया जाएगा।

3. परीक्षण की पद्धति—यदि निर्यात में संविदा में विनिर्दिष्ट नहीं है, तो सुसंगत भारतीय मानक विनिर्देशों अर्थात् समय-समय पर यथा संशोधित भा० भा० 1237—1980 में विनिर्दिष्ट परीक्षण पद्धतियों का पालन किया जाएगा।

[मं० 6(15)/80-ई०आई०एण्ड ई०पी०]

S.O 3000.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government, hereby, makes the following rules, namely:—

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Export of Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles (Inspection) Rules, 1983.

2. (2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. Definition.—In these rules, unless the context otherwise requires:—

- (a) "Act" means the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963);
- (b) "Agency" means any one of the Export Inspection Agencies established under section 7 of the Act;
- (c) "Council" means the Export Inspection Council established under section 3 of the Act.
- (d) "Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles" means tiles manufactured by pressure process from a mixture of ordinary portland cement or rapid hardening portland cement, natural aggregates and colouring material where required and includes:—
 - (i) Plain cement tiles, that is to say, tiles in the manufacture of which no pigments and stone chips are used in the wearing surface.
 - (ii) plain coloured tiles, that is to say, tiles having a plain wearing surface wherein pigments are used but without stone chips;
 - (iii) terrazzo tiles, that is to say, tiles whose wearing surface is composed of stone chips in matrix of portland cement mixed with or without pigments, but does not include chequered tiles and precast tiles.

(e) "Schedule" means a Schedule appended to these rules.

3. Basis of Inspection.—Inspection of cement concrete flooring tiles shall be carried out with a view to seeing that the consignment of cement concrete flooring tiles intended for export conforms to the specifications recognised by the Central Government under section 6 of the Act, namely (a) the relevant Indian Standards or any other National Standard, (b) contractual specifications subject to the product satisfying the minimum of the characteristics specified in the Annexure to the Order under section 6 of the Act, and (c) the specification declared by the exporter to be the agreed specifications of the export contract between the foreign buyer and the exporter, for such export contracts as are confirmed prior to the date of publication of this Order in the Official Gazette and exported within a period of sixty days from that date, on the basis of inspection and testing of finished products by adopting the scale of sampling and method of test specified in the Schedule.

4. Procedure of inspection.—(1) The exporter intending to export Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles shall give intimation in writing of his intention so to do, to the concerned Export Inspection Agency and submit along with such intimation a copy of the export contract or order to enable it to carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3.

(2) Every intimation under sub-rule (1) shall be given not less than seven days before the expected date of shipment.

(3) On receipt of the intimation under sub rule (2), the Agency shall carry out the inspection in accordance with rule 3 and instructions issued by the Council from time to time.

(4) If, after the inspection, the Agency is satisfied that the consignment of cement concrete flooring tiles to be exported complies with the requirement of rule 3, it shall, within seven days of the receipt of the intimation under sub-rule (2) issue a certificate to the exporter declaring the consignment as exportworthy;

Provided that where the Agency is not so satisfied it shall within the said period of seven days refuse to issue such certificate and communicate such refusal to the exporter along with the reasons therefor.

5. Place of Inspection.—Every inspection under these rules shall be carried out either at the premises of the manufacturer or at the premises at which the goods are offered by the exporter, provided adequate facilities for the purpose exist therein.

6. Inspection Fee.—Subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 for each consignment, a fee at the rate of forty paise for every hundred rupees of the free on board (FOB) value for each such consignment shall be paid as inspection fee except in the case of manufacturer-exporters, who are registered as small scale manufacturing units with the concerned state Government or the Union Territory and such manufacturers and exporters shall pay for each consignment an inspection fee, subject to a minimum of Rs. 20 at the rate of thirty five paise for every one hundred rupees of the free on board (FOB) value.

7. Appeal—(1) Any person aggrieved by the refusal of the inspection Agency to issue a certificate under sub-rule (4) of rule 4, may, within ten days of receipt of the communication of such refusal by him, prefer an appeal to a panel of experts consisting of not less than three but not more than seven persons as may be appointed for the purpose by the Central Government.

(2) At least two thirds of the total membership of the panel of experts shall consist of non-officials.

(3) The quorum for the panel shall be three.

(4) The appeal shall be disposed of within fifteen days of its receipt.

SCHEDULE

(See rule 3)

1. Scale of sampling.—In the absence of specific stipulation in the contractual specifications as regards sampling scale, the same as laid down below shall be applicable—

(1) All the cement concrete flooring tiles in a consignment which are of same type, class, shape and size shall be grouped together to constitute a single lot. For each characteristic the number of sample tiles to be selected from a lot shall be in accordance with the Table given below:—

Lot Size	Sample Tiles	No. of defective permissible (Acceptance Number)
(1)	(2)	(3)
Upto 150	3	0
151 to 500	5	0
501 to 3000	8	0
3001 to 10,000	10	0
10,001 to 35,000	13	1
35,001 to 1,00,000	20	2
1,00,001 and above	32	3

Note:—The tiles selected as per Table above for one characteristics, may as well, after verification of the requirements for the same, may be used for the next characteristics and so on. However, for destructive tests like wet transverse strength, water absorption, etc. separate samples shall be drawn. The thickness of the wearing layer may be measured at several points along the fracture line of the tile that was tested for wet transverse strength. For total thickness, the readings should be taken at points other than in the grooved portion on the under-side of the tile.

(2) Re-testing—In case the sample selected in accordance with Table below sub-item (1) fails to meet totally or partially the test requirements, a new sample as per Table given below shall be taken from the same consignment and tested, if so desired by the exporter.

TABLE

Lot Size	Sample Tiles	No. of defectives Permissible (Acceptance Number)
(1)	(2)	(3)
Upto 150	6	0
151 to 500	10	1
501 to 3000	16	3
3001 to 10,000	20	3
10,001 to 35,000	26	4
35,001 to 1,00,000	40	6
100001 to above	64	8

Note:—If desired by the exporter, the second set of samples may also be drawn at the time of first inspection to avoid delay.

2. Criteria of conformity—If not otherwise specified in the export contract the criteria of conformity of the tests carried out shall be as per relevant Indian Standard Specifications namely IS : 1237—1980 as amended from time to time shall be followed.

3. Methods of test.—If not specified in the export contract, test methods are specified in the relevant Indian Standard specifications, namely, IS : 1237-1980 as amended from time to time shall be followed.

C. B. KUKRETI, Jt. Director.
[F. No. 6(15)/80-EI&EP]

अधिसूचना

कां० अ० 3001.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, निर्यात (क्वालिटी नियंत्रण और निरीक्षण) अधिनियम, 1963 (1963 का 22) की धारा 7 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सीमेंट कंक्रीट की फर्श की टाइलों का निर्यात से पूर्व, निरीक्षण करने के लिए निम्नलिखित अभिकरणों को मान्यता देती है, अर्थात्:—

1. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण—कलकत्ता,
वर्ल्ड ट्रेड सेंटर,
14/1 बी० एजरा स्ट्रीट (8वीं मंजिल)
कलकत्ता-700001
2. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, मद्रास,
213, रोयपोठा हाई रोड,
मद्रास-600014
3. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, कोचीन,
मनोहर बिल्डिंग
महात्मा गांधी रोड, एनकुलम
कोचीन-682 011
4. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, बम्बई,
अमन चैम्बर (4थी मंजिल)
113, महर्षि कार्वे रोड,
बम्बई-400004

5. निर्यात निरीक्षण अभिकरण, दिल्ली,
म्यूनिसिपल मार्केट बिल्डिंग,
3, सरस्वती मार्ग,
करोल बाग,
नयी दिल्ली-110 005

इस अधिसूचना में “सीमेंट कंक्रीट फर्श की टाइलों” से ऐसी टाइलें अभिप्रेत हैं जो सामान्य पोर्टलैंड या अल्सी कड़ा होने वाले पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट, सीमेंट बनाने के लिए ताड़े हुए प्राकृतिक पत्थर और रंगीन सामग्री, जहाँ अपेक्षित हों, दाब प्रक्रिया द्वारा विनिर्मित हैं और इसके अंतर्गत—

- (क) साधारण सीमेंट की टाइलें अर्थात् जिनके विनिर्माण में सहृपन किसी प्रकार के वर्णक स्टोन-चिप्स का प्रयोग नहीं किया जाता है;
- (ख) साधारण रंगीन टाइलें अर्थात् जिनमें साधारण सहृपन पर स्टोन चिप्स रहित वर्णकों का प्रयोग किया जाता है;
- (ग) टेराजों टाइलें अर्थात् जिनकी सहृपन वर्णकों सहित या रहित मिश्रित पोर्टलैंड सीमेंट में सैट्रिक्स में स्टोन चिप्स से बनायी गयी है, किन्तु इनके अन्तर्गत रंग बिरंगी और पूर्व निर्मित नहीं हैं।

[सं० 6(15)/80-ई०आई०एण्ड ई०पी०]

सी०बी० कुकरेती, संयुक्त निदेशक ।

NOTIFICATION

S.O.3001.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1963 (22 of 1963), the Central Government hereby, recognises the following agencies for inspection of cement concrete flooring tiles prior to its export, namely:—

1. Export Inspection Agency, Calcutta,
World Trade Centre,
14/IB, Ezra Street (8th floor),
Calcutta-700001.
2. Export Inspection Agency, Madras,
213, Royapettah High Road,
Madras-600014.
3. Export Inspection Agency, Cochin,
Manohar Building,
Mahatma Gandhi Road,
Ernakulam,
Cochin-682011.
4. Export Inspection Agency, Bombay,
Aman Chamber (4th Floor),
113, M. Karve Road,
Bombay-400004.
5. Export Inspection Agency, Delhi,
Municipal Market Building,
3, Saraswati Marg,
Karol Bagh,
New Delhi-110005.

Explanation.—In this notification “Cement Concrete Flooring Tiles” means tiles manufactured by pressure process from a mixture of ordinary portland cement or rapid harden-

ing portland cement, natural aggregates and colouring material were required and includes:—

- plain cement tiles, that is to say, tiles in the manufacture of which no pigment and stone chips are used in the wearing surface.
- plain should tiles, that is to say, tiles having a plain wearing surface wherein pigment are used but without stone chips.
- terrazo tiles that is to say tiles whose wearing surface is composed of stone chips in matrix of portland cement mixed with or without pigment, but does not include chequered tiles and precast tiles.

[F. No. 6(15)/80-EI&EP]

C. B. KUKRETI, Joint Director.

मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3002—सर्वश्री होटल होलीडे इन् बलराज साहनी मार्ग जुहू बीच बम्बई को 400019 रु० के लागत-सीमा-भाड़ा मूल्य के लिए आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/ए/1456666 सी/एक्स/82/एच/83 दिनांक 15-6-83 (शोअर मैसेज का आयात करने के लिए इसी जारी करने की तिथि से 12 मास की वैधता अवधि के साथ प्रदान किया गया था। अब पार्टी ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उनसे दोनों प्रतियां खो गई हैं। पार्टी ने आई० टी० ओ० नियमों के अनुसार आवश्यक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है जिसके अनुसार उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस को किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क सदन पर पंजीकृत नहीं कराया गया था और पूर्ण रूप से अप्रयुक्त था तथा लाइसेंस में 40,000 रु० अभी भी बाकी हैं। शपथ-पत्र में यह भी बताया गया है कि यदि उक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति को बाद में ढूंढ लिया जाएगा या प्राप्त कर लिया जाएगा तो उसे जारी करने वाले प्राधिकारी को लौटा दिया जाएगा। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है और निदेश देता हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रार्थी को जारी की जानी चाहिए। आयात लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति को एतद्-द्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

[मिसिल सं० 8-एच/होटल/82-83/जी एल एस/एम एल एस/673]

Office of The Controller of Imports and Exports

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 3002.—M/s. Hotel Holiday Inn, Balraj, Sahani Marg Juhu Beach Bombay were granted an import licence No. P/A/1456666/C/XX/82/H/83 dated 15-6-82 for a C.I.F. value of Rs. 40,000 for import of Shower Massage valid for 12 months from the date of issue. Now the party have applied for grant of a Duplicate Customs Purpose/Exchange Control

Copy for the aforesaid import licence on the ground that both the copies have been lost by them. The party have furnished necessary affidavit as per I.T.O. Rules according to which the aforesaid import licence was not registered with any Customs House and was not utilised at all and the balance against the licence is Rs. 40,000. It has also been incorporated in the affidavit/declaration that if the said Customs Purpose/Exchange Control copy of the import licence is traced or found later on, it will be returned to the issuing authority. I am satisfied that the original Customs Purpose/Exchange Control copy of the import licence has been lost and direct that a Duplicate Customs Purpose/Exchange Control copy of the import licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Customs purpose/Exchange Control copy of the licence is hereby cancelled.

[File No. 8-H/Hotel/82-83/GLS/MLS/673]

लाइसेंस रद्द करने का आदेश

का० आ० 3003—सर्वश्री होलीडे इन् जुहू बीच बम्बई-400019 को लागत-सीमा-भाड़ा मूल्य 2,70,000 रु० के लिए आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/ए/1459742/1सी/एक्स एक्स/86/एच/82/एम एल एस दिनांक 3-3-1983 जिन और बियर को छोड़कर शराब का आयात करने के लिए इसी तिथि से 12 मास की वैधता अवधि के साथ जारी किया गया था। अब पार्टी ने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उनसे दोनों प्रतियां खो गई हैं। पार्टी ने आई टी ओ नियमों के अनुसार आवश्यक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किए हैं जिसके अनुसार उपर्युक्त आयात लाइसेंस किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क सदन पर पंजीकृत नहीं था और यह पूर्णरूपेण अप्रयुक्त था और लाइसेंस में अभी 2,70,000 रु० बाकी है। शपथ-पत्र में यह भी बताया गया है कि यदि उक्त आयात लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति को बाद में ढूंढ लिया जाएगा या प्राप्त कर लिया जाएगा तो उसे जारी करने वाले प्राधिकारी को लौटा दिया जाएगा। मैं संतुष्ट हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई हैं और निदेश देता हूँ कि आयात लाइसेंस की सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रार्थी को जारी की जानी चाहिए। आयात लाइसेंस की मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति/मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति को एतद्द्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

[मिसिल सं० 18/250/82-83/एम० एल० एस०/674]

शंकर चन्द, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात

कृते मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात

CANCELLATION ORDER

S.O. 3003.—M/s. Holiday Inn, Juhu Beach Bombay-400049 were granted an import licence No. P/A/1459742/C/XX/86/H/82/MLS dt. 3-3-1983 for a cif value of Rs. 2,70,000 for import of Liquor excluding gin and beer valid for 12 months from the date of issue. Now the party have applied for grant of a Duplicate Customs Purpose/Exchange Control Copy for the aforesaid import licence on the ground that the both copies have been lost by them. The party have furnished necessary affidavit as per I.T.O. Rules according to which the aforesaid import licence was not registered with any Customs House and was not utilised at all and the balance against the licence is Rs. 2,70,000. It has also been incorporated in the affidavit that if the said Customs Purpose/Exchange Control copy of the import licence is

traced or found later on, it will be returned to the issuing authority. I am satisfied that the Original Customs Purpose/Exchange Control copy of the import licence has been lost and direct that a Duplicate Customs Purpose/Exchange Control copy of the import licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Customs Purpose/Exchange Control copy of the import licence is hereby cancelled.

[File No. 18/250/82-83/MLS]

SHANKAR CHAND, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports & Exports

For Chief Controller of Imports & Exports

उपमुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय

आवेश

कोचीन, 2 जनवरी, 1983

विषय: सर्वश्री एक्सलरेटिड फ्रीज डाइंग कं०, बिल्डिंग सं० ईपी-2/500 एलूपुन्ना, पोस्ट आफिस एल्लेपैई जिला को 8 कॅन्ड मोटर पम्प सर्कुलेशन टाइप माडल वाई एम 212 आर का आयात करने के लिए जारी किए गए 1,28,800 रु० के लिए पूंजीगत माल आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/सीजी/2093260/सी/एक्सएक्स/84/ई/82 दिनांक 25-8-1982 को रद्द करना।

का० आ० 3004.—सर्वश्री एक्सलरेटिड फ्रीज डाइंग कं०, बिल्डिंग सं० ईपी-2/500 एलूपुन्ना पो० ओ० एल्लेपैई जिला को 8 कॅन्ड मोटर पम्प सर्कुलेशन टाइप माडल वाई एम-212 आर का आयात करने के लिए आयात-निर्यात नीति 1982-83 (जिल्द-1) की कंडिका 12 और आयात-निर्यात क्रियाविधि पुस्तक, 1982-83 की कंडिका 144 को ध्यान में रखते हुए 1,28,800 रु० का आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/सीजी/2093260/सी/एक्सएक्स/84/ई/82 दिनांक 25-8-82 प्रदान किया गया था।

2. यह सूचना मिली है कि लाइसेंसधारी ने संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात, मद्रास से पूंजीगत माल लाइसेंस सं० पी/सीजी/2078714 दिनांक 1-10-81 पहले से ही प्राप्त कर लिया है। और यह भी पता चला है कि उनके द्वारा नकद सहायता के लिए दिए गए प्रमाण-पत्र में मशीनरी मर्चें और अग्रिम देय आदि से भिन्न अंक दिखाया गया है जो मशीनरी के मूल्य के रूप में नहीं लिया जा सकता। इसके अतिरिक्त यह भी पाया गया है कि मर्चें आधुनिकीकरण के लिए है न कि नई परियोजना के लिए।

3. इसलिए मुझे यह समझने के लिए प्राप्त कारण हैं कि सर्वश्री एक्सलरेटिड फ्रीज डाइंग कं०, एनकुलम पो०ओ० आयात-निर्यात नीति (जिल्द-1) की कंडिका 12 के अनुसार पूंजीगत माल लाइसेंस प्रदान किए जाने के लिए पात्र नहीं हैं और इस प्रकार वह उस प्रयोजन के लिए उपयुक्त नहीं होगा जिसके लिए उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस जारी किया गया है और यही लाइसेंस भूल से जारी किया गया था।

4. अतः अधोहस्ताक्षरी यथा संशोधित आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 की कंडिका 9 में प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए 1,28,800 रु० के लिए उपर्युक्त आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/सीजी/2093260/सी/एक्सएक्स/84/ई/82 दिनांक 25-8-82 को रद्द किया जाता है।

[मिसिल सं० 25/82-83/एम/सीजी]

OFFICE OF THE DY. CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS
AND EXPORTS

ORDER

Kochin, the 2nd January, 1983

SUBJECT : Cancellation of Capital Goods Import licence No. P/CG/2093260/C/XX/84/E/82 dated 25-8-1982 For Rs. 1,28,800 issued to M/s. Accelerated Freeze Drying Co., Building No. EP II/500, Ezhupunna P.O. Alleppey Dist. for the import of eight Canned Motor Pump Circulation Tyre Model YM-212 R.

S.O. 3004.—M/s. Accelerated Freeze Drying Company, Building No. E.P. II/500, Ezhupunna P.O. Alleppey District, were granted a licence No. P/CG/2093260/C/XX/84/E/82 dt. 25-8-1982, for import of eight Canned Motor Pump Circulation Type Model YM-212 R for Rs. 1,28,800 in terms of para 12 of Import Export Policy 1982-83 (Vol. I) read with para 144 of the Hand Book 1982-83.

2. It has come to the notice that the licensee have already obtained from the Office of the Jt. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Madras a Capital Goods licence bearing No. P/CG/2078714 dt. 1-10-1981. Further it is also found that the C.A. Certificate furnished by them included figures other than that of machinery items and advances paid etc. which cannot be taken as value of machinery. Moreover it is also seen that the items is for modernisation and not for a new project.

3. I therefore have reasons to believe that M/s. Accelerated Freeze Drying Co., Ezhupunna P.O., is not eligible for C.G. Licence in terms of para 12 of Import-Export Policy 1982-83 (Vol. I) and as such the same will not serve the purposes for which the aforesaid licence was issued and the licence was issued inadvertently.

4. Therefore the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9 of Import (Control) Order, 1955 as amended cancel the aforesaid import licence No. P/CG 2093260/C/XX/84/E/82 dt. 5-8-1982 for Rs. 1,28,800.

[File No. 25/82-83/AU/CG]

विषय: सर्वश्री केरल नट फुड कं०, कदम पान्द, कुन्नापुर, कयुलीन जिला, केरला राज्य को जारी किए गए 10,000 रु० के लिए लाइसेंस सं० पी/ए/0341138 दिनांक 17-6-1982 की सीमा-शुल्क निकासी प्रयोजन प्रति रद्द करने का आदेश।

का०आ० 3005.—सर्वश्री कराना नट फुड कं० कदमपान्द, कुन्नापुर, कयुलीन जिला, केरला राज्य को एक विद्युत टाइपराइटर का आयात करने के लिए 10,000 रु० का आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/ए/0321138 दिनांक 17-6-82 प्रदान किया गया था। अब उन्होंने लाइसेंस की केवल (सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति) अनुलिपि जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन

किया है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत करण बिना और अभी तक प्रयोग में लाए बिना ही उनसे खो गया अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गया है। उन्होंने यह घोषणा की है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस का अभी तक विलुप्त भी उपयोग नहीं किया गया है।

2. अपने तर्क के समर्थन में प्रार्थी ने कोटरी पब्लिक दकुलन जिला, केरल राज्य से विधिवत मस्थापित स्टाम्प पेपर पर एक शपथ-पत्र दाखिल किया है।

3. मैं सतुष्ट हूँ कि 10,000 रु० का आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी/ए/0341138 दिनांक 17-6-82 (केवल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति) खो गया अथवा अस्थानस्थ हो गया है और इसके स्थान पर प्रार्थी को 10,000 रु० के पूरे मूल्य के लिए लाइसेंस की श्रूलिपि जारी की जानी चाहिए। 10,000 रु० के लिए जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस सं० 0341138 दिनांक 17-6-82 को सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन को मूल प्रांत को 10,000 रु० के लिए अप्रयुक्त मूल्य को रद्द किया गया संक्षता जाए।

[मं० सं० 3/82/83/ए यु/अन्य]

क० वी० शर्मा, उपमुख्य नियंत्रक,
आयात एवं निर्यात।

SUBJECT : Order of Cancellation of Customs Purpose Copy of licence No. P/A 0341138 dt. 17-6-1982 for Rs. 10,000 in favour of M/s. Kerana Nut Food Co., Kadampanad, Kunnathur, Quilon District, Kerala State.

S.O. 3005.—M/s. Kerana Nut Food Co., Kadampanad, Kunnathur, Quilon District, Kerala State was granted an import licence No P/A 0341138 dt. 17-6-1982 for Rs. 10,000 for import of one electric Typewriter. They have applied for the issue of duplicate licence (Customs Clearance Permit only) on the ground that the Customs Clearance Permit of the above licence has been lost/misplaced without having been registered with any customs authority and utilised at all. They have declared that the above said licence have not been utilised at all.

2. In support of their contention the applicant has filed an affidavit on stamped paper duly sworn before the Notary Public, Quilon District, Kerala State.

3. I am satisfied that the licence No. P/A/0341138 dt. 17-6-1982 for Rs. 10,000 (Customs Clearance Purpose copy) have been lost/misplaced and duplicate copy should be issued to the applicant in lieu thereof for the full value of Rs. 10,000. The original copy of the Customs Clearance Purpose Copy of the import licence No. 0341138 dt. 17-6-1982 for Rs. 10,000 may be deemed to have been cancelled for the unutilised value of Rs. 10,000.

[File No. 3/82-83/Au/others]

K. V. SHARMA, Dy. Chief Controller
of Imports and Exports

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय
(पेट्रोलियम विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3006—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एस० एन० बी० ओ० से दक्षिण संधाल सी टी एफ तक

पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाईपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाईनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962, (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टतः यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

डी० एस० नं० एस० एन० बी० ओ० से दक्षिण संधाल
सी० टी० एफ० से होकर एस० एन० बी० एम० एस० एन०
बी० के तक

राज्य : गुजरात जिला व० तालुका : मेहसाना

गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टर	ए	आर ई सेन्टीयर
कसलपुरा	873	0	10	20
	865	0	19	80
	863	0	01	44

[सं० 12016/88/83-प्र०]

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Department of Petroleum)

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1983

S.O. 3006.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from D.S. No. SNBO to South Santhal CTF VIA SNDM—SNBK in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1963 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent

Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from D.S. No. SNBO to South Santhal CTF Via SNBM-SNBK

State : Gujarat District & Taluka : Mehsana

Village	Block No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
Kasalpura	873	0	10	20
	865	0	19	80
	863	0	01	44

[No. 12016/88/83-Prod]

का०आ० 3007.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एम० इ० वाय से सोभासन सी टी एफ तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाईप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिश्चितता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

एस० के० वाई से सोभासन जी० जी० एस० कम सी० टी० एफ०

राज्य : गुजरात जिला व तालुका : मेहसाना

गांव	सर्वे न०	हेक्टेयर	ए आर ई	सेन्टीयर
हेबूवा	123	0	10	08
	108	0	09	60
	106	0	13	80

गांव	सर्वे न०	हेक्टेयर	ए आर ई	सेन्टीयर
	कार ट्रैक	0	00	48
	107	0	06	84
	105	0	00	72
	292 } 291 }	0	07	56
	103	0	01	92
	104	0	08	04

[स० 12016/89/83-प्रो०]

S.O. 3007.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from SEY Sobhasan GGS CUM CTF in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from SEY to Sobhasan GGS CUM CTF

State : Gujarat District & Taluka : Mehsana

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
HEBUVA	123	0	10	08
	108	0	09	60
	106	0	13	80
	Cart track	0	00	48
	107	0	06	84
	105	0	00	72
	292 } 291 }	0	07	56
	103	0	01	92
	104	0	08	04

[No. 12016/89/83-Prod.]

का०आ० 3008.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एस० इ० वाय से सोभासन सी टी एफ तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिए एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

एस० ई० वाई से सोमासन जी० जी० एस० कम सी० टी० एफ०

राज्य : गुजरात

जिला व तालुका : मेहसाना

गांव	सर्वे न०	हेक्टेयर	ए आर ई	सेन्टीयर
पुनासन	110	0	04	92
	111	0	07	20
	112	0	03	84
	113	0	10	68
	128	0	03	60
	127	0	05	40
	126	0	07	08
	130	0	04	44

[स० 12016/90/83-प्र०]

S.O.3008.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from SEY to Sobhasan GGS CUM CTF in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009.)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

Pipeline from SEY to Sobhasan GGS CUM CTF

State : Gujarat

District & Taluka : Mehsana

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
PUNASAN	110	0	04	92
	111	0	07	20
	112	0	03	84
	113	0	10	68
	128	0	03	60
	127	0	05	40
	126	0	07	08
	130	0	04	44

[No. 12016/90/83-Prod.]

का०आ० 3609.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कूप न० 86 से जे० जी० एस० III (नवागाम) तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्ट: यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कुप नं०-86 से जी जी एस० III (नवागाम) तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने, के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात जिला : खेडा, तालुका : मातर

गांव	सर्वेन०	हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टीयर
नवागाम	509	0	06	75
पणसोली	298	0	08	55
	299	0	06	12
	300	0	06	70
	305/6	0	17	79
	307/1	0	06	75
	305/3	0	06	00

[सं० 12016/91/83-प्रो०]

S.O. 3009.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from WELL No. 86 to G.G.S. III (NAWAGAM) in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares intention to acquire the right of user therein :

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodra (390009.)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from well No. 86 to GGS III (NAWAGAM)

State : Gujarat District : Kheda, Taluka : Matar

Village	Survey No.	Acc-tare	Are	Centiare
NAWAGAM	509	0	06	75
PANSOLI	298	0	08	55
	299	0	06	12
	300	0	06	70
	305/6	0	17	79
	307/1	0	06	75
	305/3	0	06	00

[No. 12016/91/83-Prod]

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3010 :—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में सोभासन-57 से डब्लू०डब्लू०टी०पी० तक पेट्रोलियम

के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए ।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतदुपाय अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है ।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है ।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग मकरपुरा रोड बड़ोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा ।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किमा विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत ।

अनुसूची

सोभासन-57 से डब्लू०डब्लू०टी०पी० तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य : गुजरात जिला और तालुका : मेहसाणा

गांव	सं० नं०	हेक्टर	एआरई	सेन्टीयर
1	2	3	4	5
पुनासन	426	0	02	64
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01	66
	18	0	09	48
	17	0	06	60
	14	0	08	76
	15	0	12	12
	12	0	05	64
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00	48
	46	0	04	44
	47	0	06	12
	64	0	00	60
	63	0	05	04
	49	0	02	16
	62	0	12	36
	92	0	04	20
	93/1	0	05	76
	93/2	0	09	36
	94	0	09	48
	88	0	03	00

1	2	3	4
	440	0	14 64
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	01 56
	441	0	07 68
	132	0	04 80
	133	0	03 60
	131	0	02 76
	130	0	07 44
	कार्ट ट्रैक	0	00 60
	126	0	05 28
	127	0	08 04
	118	0	05 28
	117/बी	0	01 20
	121	0	09 84
	120	0	00 60
	119	0	06 36

[सं० 12016/82/83-प्रोड०]

New Delhi, the 14th July, 1983

S.O. 3010.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary to the public interest that the transport of petroleum from Sob-57 to WWTP in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein:

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodra (390009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

Pipeline from SOB. 57 to W.W.T.P.

State : Gujarat

District and Taluka : Mehsana

Village	Survey No.	Hec-tare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	
Punasan	426	0	02	64
	Cart track	0	01	56
	18	0	09	48
	17	0	06	60
	14	0	08	76
	15	0	12	12
	12	0	05	64
	Cart track	0	05	48
	46	0	04	44

1	2	3	4
Punasan—Contd	47	0	06 12
	64	0	00 60
	63	0	05 04
	49	0	02 16
	62	0	12 36
	92	0	04 20
	93/1	0	05 76
	93/2	0	09 36
	94	0	09 48
	88	0	03 00
	440	0	14 64
	Cart track	0	01 56
	441	0	07 68
	132	0	04 80
	133	0	03 60
	131	0	02 76
	130	0	07 44
	Cart track	0	00 60
	126	0	05 28
	127	0	08 04
	118	0	05 28
	117/B	0	01 20
	121	0	09 84
	120	0	00 60
	119	0	06 36

[No. 12016/92/83 Prod.]

का० आ० 3011.—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में एस०एन०बी०ओ० से साउथ संचाल सीटीएफ तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाईपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पाबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

बशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, बडोदरा-9 को इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी मुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

एस० एन० बी० ओ० से माउथ सन्थाल तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य-गुजरात जिला और तालुका--मेहसाणा

गांव	सं०	हेक्टर	ए०आर०	सेन्टीअर
पंथाल	813	0	02	04
	814	0	03	00
	791/1	0	01	20
	791/2	0	04	80
	797/1	0	03	60
	789	0	08	76
	788	0	07	44
	787/1	0	06	48
	786/2	0	05	40
	819	0	04	56
	823	0	02	76
	822	0	10	56
	821	0	01	80
	874	0	16	80
	873	0	04	56
	871	0	07	56
	868	0	07	68
	869	0	06	24
	630	0	18	48
	629	0	10	30

[सं० 0-12016/93/83-प्रोड०]

S.O. 3011.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from SNBO to South Santhal CTF in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas commission:

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009.)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

462 GI/83-4

SCHEDULE

PIPELINE FROM SNBO TO SOUTH SANTHAL CTF

STATE : Gujrat DISTRICT & TALUKA : Mehsana

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Arc	Centiare
SANTHAL	813	0	02	04
	814	0	03	00
	791/1	0	01	20
	791/2	0	04	80
	797/1	0	03	60
	789	0	08	76
	788	0	07	44
	787/1	0	06	48
	786/2	0	05	40
	819	0	04	56
	823	0	02	76
	822	0	10	56
	821	0	01	80
	874	0	16	80
	873	0	04	56
	871	0	07	56
	868	0	07	68
	869	0	06	24
	630	0	18	48
	629	0	10	30

[No. 0-12016/93/83-Prod.]

का० आ० 3012:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में सोभासण 28 और 17 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पबद्ध अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की उपधारा 3 की धारा (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्वारा घोषित किया है।

वर्तते कि उक्त भूमि में हितबद्ध कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए आक्षेप सूक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और

देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधि-
सूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता
यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी
सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

सोभासन 28 और 17 तक पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य—गुजरात जिला और तालुका—मेहसाणा

गांव	सं० नं०	हेक्टेयर एअर ई	सेन्टीअर
पुन.सन	240	0 03	12
	241	0 00	96
कार्ट ट्रैक		0 01	32
	230	0 07	56
	229	0 11	88
	231	0 09	45
	143	0 11	16
	182/144	0 07	08
	181	0 10	32
	180	0 04	20
	179	0 02	38
	145	0 02	52
	146/3/सी	0 05	16
	146/1/ए	0 18	36
	147/1	0 00	72

[सं० 0-12016/94/83-प्रोड०]

S.O. 3012.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of petroleum from Sob 28 & 17 in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the schedule annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority. Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390009.)

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

PIPELINE FROM SOBHASAN-28 & 17

STATE : GUJARAT DISTRICT & TALUKA :

MEHSANA

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare
1	2	3	4	5
PUNASAN	240	0	03	12
	241	0	00	96
	Cart track	0	01	32

1	2	3	4
	230	0	07 56
	229	0	11 88
	231	0	09 45
	143	0	11 16
	182/144	0	07 08
	181	0	10 32
	180	0	04 20
	179	0	02 28
	145	0	02, 52
	146/3/C	0	05 16
	146/1/A	0	18 36
	147/1	0	00 72

[No. 0-12016/94/83-Prod.]

का० आ० 3013:—यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि लोकहित में यह आवश्यक है कि गुजरात राज्य में कलोल-111 से कलोल-7 तक पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिये पाइपलाइन तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग द्वारा बिछाई जानी चाहिए।

और यतः यह प्रतीत होता है कि ऐसी लाइनों को बिछाने के प्रयोजन के लिये एतद्पावस्त्र अनुसूची में वर्णित भूमि में उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करना आवश्यक है।

अतः अब पेट्रोलियम और खनिज पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकार का अर्जन) अधिनियम, 1962 (1962 का 50) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (ii) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उसमें उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित करने का अपना आशय एतद्द्वारा घोषित किया है।

वशर्ते कि उक्त भूमि में हितवन् कोई व्यक्ति, उस भूमि के नीचे पाइप लाइन बिछाने के लिए अक्षेप सक्षम प्राधिकारी, तेल तथा प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग, निर्माण और देखभाल प्रभाग, मकरपुरा रोड, वडोदरा-9 को इस अधि-सूचना की तारीख से 21 दिनों के भीतर कर सकेगा।

और ऐसा आक्षेप करने वाला हर व्यक्ति विनिर्दिष्टता यह भी कथन करेगा कि क्या वह यह चाहता है कि उसकी सुनवाई व्यक्तिगत हो या किसी विधि व्यवसायी की मार्फत।

अनुसूची

कूप नं० कलोल-111 से कलोल-7 तक पाइपलाइन बिछाने के लिए

राज्य—गुजरात जिला—मेहसाना तालुका—कलोल

गांव	सर्वे नं०	हेक्टर	आर	सेन्टीअर
1	2	3	4	5
धानज	195	0	13	05
	कार्टट्रेक	0	01	20
	196	0	12	90
	154	0	01	20

1	2	3	4	5
	121	0	12	60
	125	0	20	70
	138	0	17	02
	137/1	0	11	36
	137/2	0	12	43

[सं० O/12016/96/83-प्रोड०]

S.O. 3013.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of Petroleum from KALOL-111 to KALOL-7 in Gujarat State pipeline should be laid by the Oil & Natural Gas Commission;

And whereas it appears that for the purpose of laying such pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user, in the land described in the scheduled annexed hereto:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of the Section 3 of the Petroleum and Minerals Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in the Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962), the Central Government hereby declares, its intention to acquire the right of user therein;

Provided that any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this notification, object to the laying of the pipeline under the land to the Competent Authority, Oil & Natural Gas Commission, Construction & Maintenance Division, Makarpura Road, Vadodara (390 009).

And every person making such an objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

SCHEDULE

PIPELINE FROM KALOL-111 TO KALOL-7.
District : MEHSANA STATE : GUJARAT
TALUKA : KALOL

Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare
DHANAJ	195	0	13	05
	Cart track	0	01	20
	196	0	12	90
	154	0	01	20
	121	0	12	60
	125	0	20	70
	138	0	17	02
	137/1	0	11	36
	137/2	0	12	43

[No. O/12016/96/83-Prod.]

शुद्धि-पत्र

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 3014:—भारत सरकार, ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (पेट्रोलियम विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या 12016/49/83-उत्पादन दिनांक 17-5-1983 में भारत के राजपत्र के

भाग II, खण्ड 3, उप-खण्ड (ii) दिनांक 4-6-83 में का०आ० संख्या 2444 के अन्तर्गत :—

पर

जिला--मेहसाना		तालुका : कडी		
गांव	सर्वेक्षण सं०	हेक्टेयर	आर	सेंटेयर
लक्ष्मीपुरा	269/1	0	00	15

के स्थान पर

जिला : मेहसाना			तालुका : कडी	
गांव	सर्वेक्षण सं०	हेक्टेयर	आर	सेंटेयर
लक्ष्मीपुरा	169/1	0	00	15

[संख्या 12016/49/83-उत्पादन]

राजेन्द्र सिंह, निदेशक

ERRATUM

New Delhi, the 14th July, 1983

S. O. 3014.—In the notification of Government of India, in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Petroleum) No. 12016/49/83-PROD dated 17-5-83 under S.O. No. 2444 in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, Sub-Section (ii) dated 4-6-83 :—
READ

Dist : MEHSANA		TALUKA : KADI		
Village	Survey No.	Hectare	Are	Centiare
LAXMIPURA	269/1	0	00	15

FOR

DIST : MEHSANA		TALUKA : KADI		
Village	Survey No.	Hectare Ar : Centiare		
LAXMIPURA	169/1	0	00	15

[No. 12016/49/83-Prod.]

RAJENDRA SINGH, Director

(कोयला विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 11 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3015.—कोककर कोयला खान (राष्ट्रीयकरण) अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 36) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की प्रथम अनुसूची में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है :—

कोककर कोयला खान (राष्ट्रीयकरण) अधिनियम, 1972 (1972 का 36) की प्रथम अनुसूची में क्रम सं० 1 के सामने कालम सं० 4 में विद्यमान प्रविष्टि के लिए “बिहार सरकार” पढ़ा जाए।

[फा० सं० 11024(11)/81-सी० ए०]

ल० ना० लड़ठा, संयुक्त सचिव

(Department of Coal)

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1983

S.O. 3015.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 (36 of 1972), the Central Government

hereby makes the following correction in the First Schedule to the said Act, namely:—

In the First Schedule to the Coking Coal Mines (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 (36 of 1972), against serial number 1, in column number 4, for the existing entry, read "Government of Bihar."

[File No. 11024(11)/81-CA]

L. N. LADDHA, Jt. Secy.






नागरिक पुर्ति मंत्रालय**भारतीय मानक संस्था**

नई दिल्ली, दिनांक 1983-06-30

का०आ० 3016:—भारत के राजपत्र भाग II खंड 3 उपखंड (ii) दिनांक 1964-11-16 में प्रकाशित तत्कालीन और पुर्ति मंत्रालय (उद्योग विभाग) (भारतीय मानक संस्था) अधिसूचना संख्या एम ओ 3950 दिनांक 1964-11-12 के आंशिक संशोधन के रूप में भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि भारतीय टाट सम्बन्धी मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन का पुनरीक्षण किया गया है। मानक चिह्न की पुनरीक्षित डिजाइन तत्सम्बन्धी मानक का शीर्षक और डिजाइन का शाब्दिक विवरण सहित निम्नलिखित अनुसूची में दिए हैं।

भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन मुहर) अधिनियम, 1952 और उसके अधीन बने नियमों और विनियमों के कार्यों के लिए यह मानक चिह्न 1983-05-23 से लागू होंगे।

अनुसूची






क्रम संख्या	मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन	उत्पाद/उत्पादन की श्रेणी	तत्सम्बन्धी भारतीय मानक की पदसंख्या और शीर्षक	मानक चिह्न के डिजाइन का शाब्दिक विवरण
1	2	3	4	5
		भारतीय टाट	IS : 2818 (भाग 2)—1971 भारतीय टाट की विशिष्टि भाग 2—350 और 229 ग्राम प्रति वर्ग मीटर नमी के लिए 16 प्रतिशत प्राप्ति की करार पर (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें ISI शब्द होते हैं स्तम्भ (2) में दिखाई गई शैली और अनुपात में तैयार किया गया है और जैसा डिजाइन में दिखाया गया है मोनोग्राम के ऊपर की ओर भारतीय मानक की संख्या दी है और मोनोग्राम के नीचे की ओर तत्सम्बन्धी भाग की संख्या दी है।
		भारतीय टाट	IS : 2818 (भाग 3)—1971 भारतीय टाट की विशिष्टि भाग 3—213 और 270 ग्राम प्रति वर्ग मीटर नमी के लिए 16 प्रतिशत प्राप्ति की करार पर।	भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें शब्द होते हैं स्तम्भ (2) में दिखाई गई शैली और अनुपात में तैयार किया गया है और जैसा डिजाइन में दिखाया गया है मोनोग्राम के ऊपर की ओर भारतीय मानक की संख्या दी है और मोनोग्राम के नीचे की ओर तत्संबन्धी भाग की संख्या दी है।
			IS : 2818 (भाग 4)—1971 भारतीय टाट की विशिष्टि भाग 4—213 और 270 ग्राम वर्ग मीटर नमी के लिए 14 प्रतिशत प्राप्ति की करार पर	
			IS : 2818 (भाग 5)—1971 भारतीय टाट की विशिष्टि भाग 5—298 ग्राम प्रति वर्ग मीटर नमी के लिए 16 प्रतिशत प्राप्ति की करार पर	
			IS : 2818 (भाग 6)—1971 भारतीय टाट की विशिष्टि 245 ग्राम प्रति वर्ग मीटर नमी के लिए 16 प्रतिशत प्राप्ति की करार पर	

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES
INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION
 New Delhi, 1983-06-30

S.O. 3016 :— In partial modification of the then Ministry of Industry and Supply (Department of Industry) (Indian Standards Institution) notification number S.O. 3950 dated 1964-11-12 published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section-3, Sub-section (ii) dated 1964-11-16, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the design of the standard mark for Indian Hessian has been revised. The revised designs of the standard marks, together with the title of the relevant Indian Standard and verbal description of the designs are given in the following Schedule:

These standard marks for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 1983-05-23:

SCHEDULE











Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Product	No. & Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the standard mark
1	2	3	4	5
		Indian Hessian	IS : 2818 (Part II)—1971 Specification for Indian hessian : Part II 305 and 229 g/m ² at 16 per cent contract regain (first revision)	The monograms of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian standard being superscribed on the top side and the relevant parts number being superscribed under the bottom side of the monograms as indicated in the designs.
		Indian hessian	IS : 2818 (Part III)—1971 Specification for Indian hessian: Part III 213 and 270 g/m ² at 16 per cent contract regain	The monograms of the Indian Standards Institution consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian standard being superscribed on the top side and the relevant parts number being superscribed under the bottom side of the monograms as indicated in the designs.
			IS : 2818 (Part IV)—1971 Specification for Indian hessian; Part IV 213 and 270 g/m ² at 14 per cent contract regain	
			IS : 2818 (Part V)—1974 Specification for Indian hessian : Part V 298 g/m ² at 16 per cent contract regain	
			IS : 2818 (Part VI)—1977 Specification for Indian hessian: Part VI 245 g/m ² at 16 per cent contract regain	







[No. CMD/13 : 9]

का०आ० 3017:— भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से एनडिआर सूचित किया जाता है कि स्तम्भ 2 और 3 में दिए गए विभिन्न वस्तुओं से सम्बद्ध मुहर लगाने का भारतीय मानक डिजाइन में स्तम्भ 4 में दिए गए, व्योमों के अनुसार संशोधन किया गया है और इन मुहर लगाने की संशोधित डिजाइनों के शास्त्रिक विवरण स्तम्भ 5 में दिए गए हैं।

भारतीय मानक संस्था प्रमाणन मुहर अधिनियम, 1952 और इसके अधीन बने नियमों और विनियमों के कार्यों के लिए यह संशोधित डिजाइन प्रत्येक के आने की यह तिथियों से लागू होंगी।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	उत्पाद	भारतीय मानक की संख्या	मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन	मानक चिह्न के डिजाइन का शाब्दिक विवरण	भाग के राजपत्र भाग II-खंड 3 उपखंड (ii) का संदर्भ	अधिकृत एसओ संख्या	आंशिक रूप से संशोधित एसओ संख्या	जारी होने की तारीख	लागू होने की तिथि
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	
1.	मृदु इस्पात और मध्यम पराभव इस्पात की छड़ें	IS: 432 (भाग I) 1966		भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें ISI शब्द होते हैं स्तम्भ 4 में दिखाई गई गैली और अनुपात के अनुसार तैयार किया गया है और जैसा डिजाइन में दिखाया गया है उस मोनो- ग्राम के ऊपर की ओर भारतीय मानक संख्या और मोनोग्राम के नीचे की ओर तत्सम्बन्धी भाग संख्या दी गई है।	---	3541 1963-12-11		1963-12-21	1982-10-01
2.	सख्त बिछे इस्पात के तार	IS: 432 (भाग II) 1966		"	---	"	"	"	"
3.	चट्टों की मेटल आर्क ब्रेकिंग उत्पादों के लिए ठके इलेक्ट्रोड्स	IS: 814 (भाग I) 1974		"	---	1155 1980-04-09		1980-04-26	1982-05-16
4.	मेटल आर्क ब्रेकिंग चट्टों के लिए ठके इलेक्ट्रोड्स	IS: 814 (भाग II) 1974		"	---	"	"	"	"
5.	जल गैस और मल निकास दाब पाइपों फ्लैजकृत साकेट के लिए ढलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS: 1538 (भाग 7) 1976		"	---	3023 1971-07-20		1971-08-14	1982-06-01
6.	जल गैस और मल निकास दाब पाइप, फ्लैज स्पिंगर के लिए ढलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS: 1538 (भाग 8) 1976		"	---	"	"	"	"
7.	जल गैस और मल निकास दाब पाइपों, कोलसे के लिए ढलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS: 1538 (भाग 9) 1976		"	---	"	"	"	"
8.	जल गैस और मल निकास दाब पाइपों, टी से साकेट के लिए ढलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS: 1538 (भाग 11) 1976		"	---	"	"	"	"
9.	जल गैस और मल निकास दाब पाइपों, काट से साकेट के लिए ढलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS: 1538 (भाग 13) 1976		"	---	"	"	"	"
10.	जल गैस और मल निकास दाब पाइपों, दोहरे फ्लैज कृत बैंड के लिए ढलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS: 1538 (भाग 18) 1976		"	---	"	"	"	"


1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
11.	जल, गैस और मल निकास के लिए बाब पाइपों से फ्लैजकृत टी के लिए बलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS : 1538 (भाग 19)-1976		भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम जिसमें ISI शब्द होते हैं स्तम्भ 4 में दिखाई गई शैली और अनुपात के अनुसार तैयार किया गया है और जैसा डिजाइन में दिखाया गया है उस मोनो- ग्राम के ऊपर की ओर भारतीय मानक की संख्या और मोनोग्राम की नीचे की ओर तत्सम्बन्धी भाग संख्या दी गई है।	---	3023 1971-07-20	1971-08-14	1982-06-01
12.	जल, गैस और मल निकास के लिए बाब पाइपों, दोहरे फ्लैजकृत के लिए बलवां लोहे की फिटिंग	IS : 1538 (भाग 21)-1976		"	---	"	"	"
13.	चमकदार स्प्रिंगों के निर्माण के लिए इस्पात (रेल डिब्बों के साफेट), फ्लैट सेक्शन	IS : 3885 (भाग 1)-1977		"	---	884 1973-03-12	1973-03-24	1982-10-01
14.	चमकदार स्प्रिंग के निर्माण के लिए इस्पात (रेल डिब्बों के साफेट), रिव और यू सेक्शन	IS : 3885 (भाग 2)-1976		"	---	"	"	"
15.	पेंटिंगकृत तथा ठंडे खिंचे इस्पात अधि- मित तार	IS : 4454 (भाग 1)-1975		"	---	2975 1977-09-01	1977-09-24	"
16.	जल, गैस और मल निकास एसबसटस सीमेंट दाब पाइपों के लिए बलवां लोहे के सेक्शन	IS : 5531 (भाग 3)-1977		"	---	2348 1978-07-27	1978-08-19	"













[संतो.एम.सी./13:9]




S.O. 3017.—The Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the designs of the standard marks pertaining to various products referred to in Cols. 2 and 3 have been of the following schedule have been revised as given in Col. 4 and the verbal description of the revised designs of the standard marks, are given in Col. 5 thereof.

The revised designs of the standard marks, for the purposes of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder shall come into force with effect from the dates shown against each.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product	IS : No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark	Reference to Govt. of India Gazette Notification Part II, Section-3, Sub-Section (ii)			Date of Effect
					Superseded S.O. No.	Partially Modified S.O. No.	Date of Issue	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Mild steel and medium tensile steel bars	IS : 432 (Part I)-1966		The monograms of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI' drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (4); the number of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram and the relevant part number being subscribed under the bottom sides of the monograms as indicated in the design.	—	3541 1963-12-11	1963-12-21	1982-10-01

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
2.	Hard drawn steel wire	IS : 432 (Part II)- 1966		The monograms of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI' drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (4); the number of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram and the relevant part number being subscribed under the bottom sides of the monograms as indicated in the design	—	3541 1963-12-11	1963-12-21	1982-10-01
3.	Covered electrodes for metal arc welding products other than sheets	IS : 814 (Part I)- 1974		-do-	—	1155 1980-04-09	1980-04-26	1982-05-16
4.	Covered electrodes for metal arc welding sheets	IS : 814 (Part II)- 1974		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
5.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water and sewage : flanged sockets	IS : 1538 (Part VII)- 1976		-do-	—	3023 1971-07-20	1971-08-14	1982-06-01
6.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water and sewage : flanged spigots	IS : 1538 (Part VIII)- 1976		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
7.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage : collars	IS : 1538 (Part IX)- 1976		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
8.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes, for water gas and sewage : tees, all sockets	IS : 1538 (Part XI)- 1976		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
9.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage : crosses, all sockets.	IS : 1538 (Part XIII)- 1976		-do-	—	3023 1971-07-20	1971-08-14	1982-06-01
10.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage : double flanged bends	IS : 1538 (Part XVIII)-1976		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
11.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage : all flanged tees	IS : 1538 (Part XIX)-1976		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
12.	Cast iron fittings for pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage : double flanged tapers	IS : 1538 (Part XXI)-1976		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
13.	Steel for the manufacture of laminated springs (railway rolling socket): flat sections	IS : 3885 (Part I)- 1977		-do-	—	884 1973-03-12	1973-03-24	1982-10-01

14. Steel for the manufacture of laminated springs (railway rolling socket): rib and groove sections	IS : 3885(Part II)-1969		-do-	—	-do-	-do-	-do-
15. Patented and cold drawn steel wires—unalloyed	IS : 4454(Part I)-1975		-do-	2975 1977-09-01	—	1977-09-24	-do-
16. Cast iron specials for asbestos-cement pressure pipes for water, gas and sewage	IS : 5531(Part III)-1977		-do-	—	2348 1978-07-27	1978-08-19	-do-

[No. C M D/13:9]

क्र।० आ० 3018-समय समय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 8 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन 297 खाद्यसंकेतों के ग्यारे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, उनका नवम्बर, 1982 में नवीकरण किया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	सी एम/एल संख्या	वैद्य	भारतीय मानक विनिर्दिष्ट की पद	मौलिक संख्या
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	00036 12	82-11-16	83 11 15	IS : 398 (भाग 1) —1976
2.	00037 13	82-11-16	83 11-15	IS : 434 (भाग 1) —1964
3.	00096 24	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 411—1981
4.	00153 16	82-11-01	83 10 31	IS : 560—1969
5.	00195 26	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 303—1975
6.	00317 18	82-11-01	83 10 31	IS : 692—1973
7.	00349 26	82-11-01	83 10 31	IS : 1554 (भाग 1) —1976
8.	00389 34	82-11-16	83 11 15	IS : 694—1977
9.	00430 18	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 226—1975
10.	00633 27	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 277—1977
11.	00634 28	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 1079—1973
12.	00635 29	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 1977—1975
13.	00636 30	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 2062—1980
14.	00653 31	82-08-16	83 08-15	IS : 779—1978
15.	00696 42	82-11-16	83 11 15	IS : 1554 (भाग 1) —1976
16.	00782 39	82-10-16	83 10 15	IS : 1785—1966
17.	00792 41	82-10-16	83 10 15	IS : 398—1976
18.	00857 41	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
19.	00869 45	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2818 (भाग 2) —1971
20.	00870 38	81-12-01	82 11 30	IS : 2566—1965
21.	00874 42	81-12-01	82 11 30	IS : 2566—1965
22.	00880 40	81-12-01	82-11 30	IS : 2566—1965
23.	00898 50	81-12-01	82 11 30	IS : 2566—1965
24.	00941 36	81-12-01	82 11 30	IS : 2818 (भाग 2) —1971
25.	00948 43	81-12-01	82 11 30	IS : 2566—1965
26.	00958 45	81-12 01	82 11 30	IS : 2566—1965
27.	01041 13	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 1875—1978
28.	01042 14	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 2830—1975
29.	01043 15	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 2831—1975
30.	01125 16	82-09-01	83 08 31	IS : 1855—1977
31.	01126 17	82-09-01	83 08 31	IS : 2266—1977
32.	01147 22	82-10-16	83 10 15	IS : 1977—1975
33.	01274 28	82-10-16	83 10 15	IS : 1851—1975
34.	01317 22	82-10-16	83 10 15	IS : 3975—1979
35.	01328 25	82-09-16	83 09 15	IS : 6257—1971
36.	01329 26	82-09-16	83 09 15	IS : 5444—1978
37.	01340 21	82-10-01	83 09 30	IS : 3196—1974
38.	01430 32	82-11-01	83 10 31	IS : 780—1980

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
39.	01514 25	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1011—1981
40.	01525 28	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1507—1977
41.	01562 33	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 10 (भाग 4) —1976
42.	01609 31	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 10 (भाग 4) —1976
43.	01730 31	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1856—1977
44.	01767 44	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1703—1977
45.	01817 37	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 398 (भाग 2) —1975
46.	01831 35	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1786—1979
47.	01933 40	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 3901—1975
48.	01987 54	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1308—1974
49.	02024 16	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4783—1968
50.	02025 17	82-11 01	83-10-31	IS : 4766—1968
51.	02079 31	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 561—1978
52.	02080 24	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 562—1978
53.	02082 26	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 565—1975
54.	02083 27	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 632—1978
55.	02084 28	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1307—1973
56.	02086 30	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2567—1978
57.	02107 18	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 10 (भाग 4) —1976
58.	02117 20	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 10 (भाग 4) —1976
59.	02118 21	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 3900—1975
60.	02158 29	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 561—1978
61.	02161 24	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2865—1978
62.	02170 25	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 564—1975
63.	02232 22	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 1322—1970
64.	02237 27	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1307—1973
65.	02254 28	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1989 (भाग 1) —1978
66.	02282 32	82-10 01	83-09-30	IS : 2567—1978
67.	02307 24	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 2347—1974
68.	02406 26	82-06-16	83-11-15	IS : 561—1978
69.	02436 32	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2593—1964
70.	02438 34	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4320—1967
71.	02448 36	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 398 (भाग 2) —1976
72.	02477 41	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 561—1978
73.	02501 24	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 3623—1978
74.	02581 40	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 561—1978
75.	02595 46	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2682—1966
76.	02678 48	81-12 01	82-11-30	IS : 2580—1965
77.	02706 35	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 633—1975
78.	02730 35	82-11 01	83-10-31	IS : 4323—1980
79.	02744 41	82-10 01	83-09-30	IS : 562—1978
80.	02771 44	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 3905—1966
81.	02772 45	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 5277—1978
82.	02814 38	82-11-16	84 05-15	IS : 1307—1973
83.	02825 41	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
84.	02874 50	82-11-01	83 10 31	IS : 5281—1979

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
85.	02875 51	82 11 01	83 10 31	IS : 2861—1980	133.	04734 47	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 4246—1978
86.	03005 17	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 1601—1960	134.	04755 52	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 561—1978
87.	03039 27	82 10 16	83 10 15	IS : 398 (भाग 1) —1976	135.	04766 55	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2567—1978
88.	03168 35	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 1601—1960	136.	04767 56	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 814 (भाग 1 और 2)—1974
89.	03171 30	82 10 01	83-09 30	IS : 2566—1965	137.	04768 57	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1601—1960
90.	03173 32	82 01-16	83-01-15	IS : 4335—1967	138.	04769 58	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 427—1965
91.	03175 34	82 01 16	83-01-15	IS : 4526—1976	139.	04784 57	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2148—1968
92.	03182 33	82 10 16	83 10 15	IS : 2566—1965	140.	04785 58	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 561—1978
93.	03190 33	82 11 01	83 10 31	IS : 1601—1960	141.	04786 59	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1660 (भाग 1) —1967
94.	03193 36	82 11 01	83 10 31	IS : 398 (भाग 1 और 2)—1976	142.	04792 57	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 325—1978
95.	03222 24	81 12 01	82 11 30	IS : 1943—1964	143.	04881 57	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4723—1978
96.	03387 44	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 6240—1976	144.	04898 66	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 562—1978
97.	03458 42	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 633—1975	145.	05013 25	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 633—1975
98.	03479 47	82 11 01	83 10 31	IS : 3623—1978	146.	05015 27	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 7122—1973
99.	03491 43	82 10 16	83 10 15	IS : 6003—1970	147.	05486 54	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 561—1978
100.	03544 39	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 1660 (भाग 4) —1977	148.	05549 52	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 561—1978
101.	03559 46	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 5430—1981	149.	05573 52	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 5346—1975
102.	03562 41	82 10 16	83 10 15	IS : 2509—1973	150.	05582 53	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 10 (भाग 2) —1976
103.	03570 41	82 10 16	83 10 15	IS : 398—1976	151.	05622 44	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6914—1978
104.	03600 30	82 11 16	83 11 15	IS : 564—1975	152.	05667 57	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6915—1978
105.	03686 52	82 01 16	83 01 15	IS : 5648—1970	153.	05811 47	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1307—1973
106.	03742 43	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 5852—1977	154.	05943 58	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 633—1975
107.	03827 47	82 11 16	83 11 15	IS : 1239 (भाग 1)—1979	155.	05979 70	82-04-01	83-03-31	IS : 5346—1975
108.	03944 51	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 563—1973	156.	06264 46	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 3903—1973
109.	03956 55	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 633—1975	157.	06304 37	82-08-01	83-07-31	IS : 561—1978
110.	04024 24	82 10 16	83 10 15	IS : 2925—1975	158.	06341 42	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 4174—1977
111.	04103 22	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 7122—1973	159.	06368 53	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 564—1975
112.	04110 21	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 7185—1981	160.	06381 50	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 4588—1977
113.	04220 26	82 11 01	83-10 31	IS : 1476—1971	161.	06405 41	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 8028—1976
114.	04412 32	82 11 01	83 10 31	IS : 2682—1966	162.	06406 42	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 7285—1974
115.	04413 33	82 11 01	83 10 31	IS : 6439—1978	163.	06435 47	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5430—1981
116.	04618 44	82 11 01	83 10 31	IS : 565—1975	164.	06436 48	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5086—1981
117.	04623 41	82 09 16	83 09 15	IS : 2567—1978	165.	06441 45	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 427—1965
118.	04650 44	82 10 01	83 09 30	IS : 325—1978	166.	06444 48	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 780—1980
119.	04657 51	82 10 01	83-09-30	IS : 561—1978	167.	06449 53	82-08-01	83-09-30	IS : 916—1975
120.	04658 52	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 562—1978	168.	06458 54	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4175—1981
121.	04668 54	82-09-16	84-04-15	IS : 6914—1978	169.	06471 51	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 398 (भाग 2) —1976
122.	04672 50	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 398—1976	170.	06473 53	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4894—1968
123.	04688 58	82-07-16	83-07-15	IS : 226—1978	171.	06476 56	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1222—1973
124.	04696 58	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1848—1981	172.	06482 54	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6073—1971
125.	04698 60	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848—1981	173.	06483 55	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 5482—1969
126.	04699 61	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848—1981	174.	06496 60	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2834—1981
127.	04700 37	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848—1981	175.	06500 39	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2566—1965
128.	04708 45	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848—1981	176.	06516 47	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 561—1978
129.	04714 43	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848—1981	177.	06520 43	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2580—1965
130.	04715 44	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848—1981	178.	06526 49	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 5557—1969
131.	04730 43	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 633—1975	179.	06530 45	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2148—1968
132.	04733 46	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1520—1980 IS : 325—1978	180.	06532 47	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2448 (भाग 2) —1968
					181.	06538 53	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1239 (भाग-1) —1979
					182.	06975 70	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2339—1963
					183.	07141 40	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 7121—1973
					184.	07181 48	82-09-01	83-05-31	IS : 2255—1977

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
185.	07195 54	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2567—1978	231.	08643 61	82-05-01	83-04-30	IS : 6750—1972
186.	07222 40	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2653—1980	232.	08778 75	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
187.	07223 41	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2653—1980	233.	08856 72	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 6750—1972
188.	07224 42	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2653—1980	234.	08861 69	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 428—1968
189.	07225 43	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5281—1979	235.	08928 71	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 1977—1975
190.	07229 47	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 737—1974	236.	08941 68	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 8497—1977
191.	07243 45	82-09-16	83-11-15	IS : 1161—1979	237.	08953 72	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 10, (भाग 3)—1974
192.	07252 46	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 325—1978	238.	08968 79	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1786—1979
193.	07255 49	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 8487—1977	239.	08970 73	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 8180—1976
194.	07257 51	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 226—1975	240.	08971 74	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 261—1966
195.	07270 48	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 2906—1980	241.	08973 76	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1786—1979
196.	07310 39	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2339—1963	242.	08974 77	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 226—1975
197.	07313 42	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 4654—1974	243.	08978 81	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 5672—1970
198.	07395 60	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 4900—1969	244.	08988 83	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 3589—1966
199.	07396 61	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2818 (भाग 2)—1971	245.	08992 79	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 4654—1974
200.	07397 62	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965	246.	09001 37	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 562—1978
201.	07898 78	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 398 (भाग 2)—1976	247.	09010 38	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 4497—1977
202.	07993 76	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 1051—1980	248.	09018 46	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 1341—1976
203.	07995 78	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 722 (भाग 1)—1977	249.	09021 41	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 1061—1975
204.	07997 80	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 6914—1978	250.	09024 44	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398 (भाग 1 और 2)—1976
205.	08007 39	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1554 (भाग 1)—1976	251.	09042 46	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398 (भाग 2)—1976
206.	08043 43	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398 (भाग 1)—1976	252.	09047 51	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 7121—1973
207.	08047 47	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 6595—1980	253.	09050 46	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 2653—1980
208.	08048 48	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 6914—1978	254.	09051 57	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 2653—1980
209.	08050 42	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 8054—1976	255.	09079 59	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 5411 (भाग 1)—1977
210.	08058 50	82-11-16	83-10-31	IS : 2074—1979	256.	09086 58	82-11-16	83-12-31	IS : 158—1968
211.	08074 50	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1554 (भाग 1)—1976	257.	09094 58	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1370—1976
212.	08077 53	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4654—1974	258.	09106 45	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 8391—1977
213.	08083 51	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2202 (भाग 1)—1973	259.	09107 46	81-11-16	82-11-15	IS : 7406 (भाग 1)—1974
214.	08091 51	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 8500—1977	260.	09119 50	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 758—1975
215.	08117 44	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 8028—1976	261.	09120 43	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 758—1975
216.	08123 42	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 5086—1969	262.	09125 48	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2567—1978
217.	08159 54	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 4760—1968	263.	09130 45	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 565—1977
218.	08178 57	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	264.	09132 47	81-11-16	82-11-15	IS : 2366—1965
219.	08180 51	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	265.	09134 49	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 168—1973
220.	08181 52	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 3794—1966	266.	09169 60	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS : 1391—1971
221.	08182 53	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	267.	09916 71	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 3055 (भाग 1)—1977
222.	08200 38	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 7098 (भाग 2)—1973	268.	09927 74	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 398 (भाग 2)—1976
223.	08238 52	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2874—1964	269.	09933 72	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 325—1978
224.	08239 53	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 3984—1967	270.	09934 73	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 7538—1975
225.	08240 46	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	271.	09942 73	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 1507—1977
226.	08254 52	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	272.	09971 78	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 8144—1976
227.	08303 44	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	273.	09975 82	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 171—1973
228.	08317 50	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	274.	10004 09	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 4654—1974
229.	08391 60	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943—1964	275.	10005 10	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 4654—1974
230.	08392 61	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2874—1964	276.	10011 08	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 1786—1979
					277.	10012 09	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 226—1975
					278.	10013 10	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398 (भाग 2)—1976

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
279.	10015 12	82-11-01	84-03-31	IS : 1759—1980
280.	10016 13	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 691—1966
281.	10024 13	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 260—1969
282.	10032 13	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 8448—1977
283.	10035 16	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2653—1980
284.	10038 19	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 565—1975
285.	10041 14	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6750—1972
286.	10042 15	82-11-01	83-11-15	IS : 226—1975
287.	10053 18	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2681—1979
288.	10056 21	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2148—1968
289.	10064 21	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 4654—1974
290.	10069 26	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1786—1979
291.	10075 24	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 335—1972
292.	10077 26	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 7121—1973
293.	10092 25	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS : 7406 (भाग 2)—1980
294.	10111 11	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS : 2569—1978
295.	10119 19	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS : 4766—1968
296.	10120 12	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS : 4984—1978
297.	10129 21	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS : 7122—1973

[सं० सी एम डी/13 : 12]

ए०पी० बनर्जी, अपर सहायनियेक्षक

S. O. 3018.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby notifies that 297 licences, particulars of which are given in the following Schedule, have been renewed during the month of November 1982:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	CM/L No.	Valid From	To	Indian Standard Specification No.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	00036 12	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 398 (Part I)—1976
2.	00037 13	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 434 (Part I)—1964
3.	00096 24	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 411—1981
4.	00153 16	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 560—1969
5.	00195 26	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 303—1975
6.	00317 18	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 692—1973
7.	00349 26	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1554 (Part I)—1976
8.	00389 34	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 694—1977
9.	00430 18	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 226—1975
10.	00633 27	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 277—1977
11.	00634 28	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1079—1973

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
12.	00635 29	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1977—1975
13.	00636 30	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2062—1980
14.	00653 31	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 779—1978
15.	00696 42	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1554 (Part I)—1976
16.	00782 39	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 1785—1966
17.	00792 41	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398—1976
18.	00857 41	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
19.	00869 45	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2818 (Part II)—1973
20.	00870 38	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
21.	00874 42	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
22.	00880 40	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
23.	00898 50	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
24.	00941 36	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2818 (Part II)—1971
25.	00948 43	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
26.	00958 45	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566—1965
27.	01041 13	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1875—1978
28.	01042 14	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2830—1975
29.	01043 15	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2831—1975
30.	01125 16	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 1855—1977
31.	01126 17	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 2266—1977
32.	01147 22	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 1977—1975
33.	01274 28	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 1851—1975
34.	01317 22	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 3975—1979
35.	01328 25	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 6257—1971
36.	01329 26	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 5444—1978
37.	01340 21	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 3196—1974
38.	01480-32	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 780—1980
39.	01514-25	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1011—1981

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
40.	01525 28	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1507-1977	69.	02436 32	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2593-1964
41.	01562 33	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 10 (Part IV)-1976	70.	02438 34	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4320-1967
42.	01609 31	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : (10 (Part IV)-1976	71.	02448 36	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 398 (Part II)-1976
43.	01730 31	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1856-1977	72.	02477 41	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 561-1978
44.	01767 44	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1703-1977	73.	02501 24	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 3623-1978
45.	01817 37	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 398 (Part II)-1975	74.	02581 40	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 561-1978
46.	01831 35	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1786-1979	75.	02595 46	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2682-1966
47.	01933 40	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 3901-1975	76.	02678 48	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2580-1965
48.	01987 54	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1308-1974	77.	02706 35	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 633-1975
49.	02024 16	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4783-1968	78.	02730 35	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4323-1980
50.	02025 17	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4766-1968	79.	02744 41	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 562-1978
51.	02079 31	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 561-1978	80.	02771 44	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 3905-1966
52.	02080 24	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 562-1978	81.	02772 45	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 5277-1978
53.	02082 26	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 565-1975	82.	02814 38	82-11-16	84-05-15	IS : 1307-1973
54.	02083 27	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 632-1978	83.	02825 41	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566-1965
55.	02084 28	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1307-1973	84.	02874 50	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 5281-1979
56.	02086 30	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2567-1978	85.	02875 51	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2861-1980
57.	02107 18	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)-1976	86.	03005 17	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1601-1960
58.	02117 20	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 10 (Part IV)-1976	87.	03039 27	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398 (Part I)-1976
59.	02118 21	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 3900-1975	88.	03168 35	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1601-1960
60.	02158 29	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 561-1978	89.	03171 30	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2566-1965
61.	02161 24	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2865-1978	90.	03173 32	82-01-16	83-01-15	IS : 4335-1967
62.	02170 25	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 564-1975	91.	03175 34	82-01-16	83-01-15	IS : 4526-1976
63.	02232 22	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 1322-1970	92.	03182 33	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 2566-1965
64.	02237 27	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1307-1973	93.	03190 33	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1601-1960
65.	02254 28	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1989 (Part I)-1978	94.	03193 36	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 398 (Part I & II)-1976
66.	02282 32	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2567-1978	95.	03222 24	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943-1964
67.	02307 24	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 2347-1974	96.	03387 44	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 6240-1976
68.	02406 26	82-06-16	83-09-15	IS : 561-1978					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
97.	03458 42	82-10-01	82-09-30	IS : 633-1975	128.	04708 45	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848-1981
98.	03479 47	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 3623-1978	129.	04714 43	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848-1981
99.	03491 43	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 6003-1970	130.	04715 44	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848-1981
100.	03544 39	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1660 (Part-IV)-1977	131.	04730 43	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 633-1975
101.	03559 46	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5430-1981	132.	04733 46	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1520-1980 IS : 325-1978
102.	03562 41	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 2509-1973	133.	04734 47	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 4246-1978
103.	03570 41	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398-1976	134.	04755 52	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 561-1978
104.	03600 30	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 564-1975	135.	04766 55	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2567-1978
105.	03686 52	82-01-16	83-01-15	IS : 5648-1970	136.	04767 56	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 814 (Parts I--& II)-1974
106.	03742 43	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5852-1977	137.	04768 57	82-01-01	83-09-30	IS : 1601-1960
107.	03827 47	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1239 (Part-I)-1979	138.	04769 58	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 427-1965
108.	03944 51	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 563-1973	139.	04784 57	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2148-1968
109.	03956 55	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 633-1975	140.	04785 58	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 561-1978
110.	04024 24	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 2952-1975	141.	04786 59	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1660 (Part-I)-1967
111.	04103 22	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 7122-1973	142.	04792 57	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 325-1978
112.	04110 21	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 7185-1981	143.	04881 57	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4723-1978
113.	04220 26	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1476-1971	144.	04898 66	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 562-1978
114.	04412 32	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2682-1966	145.	05013 25	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 633-1975
115.	04413 33	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6439-1978	146.	05015 27	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 7122-1973
116.	04618 44	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 565-197	147.	05486 54	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 561-1978
117.	04623 41	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 2567-1978	148.	05549 52	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 561-1978
118.	04650 44	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 325-1978	149.	05573 52	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 5346-1975
119.	04657 51	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 561-1978	150.	05582 53	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 10 (Part-II)-1976
120.	04658 52	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 562-1978	151.	05622 44	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6914-1978
121.	04668 54	82-09-16	84-04-15	IS : 6914-1978	152.	05667 57	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6915-1978
122.	04672 50	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 398-1976	153.	05811 47	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1307-1973
123.	04688 58	82-07-16	83-07-15	IS : 226-1978	154.	05943 58	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 633-1975
124.	04696 58	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1848-1981	155.	05979 70	82-04-10	83-03-31	IS : 5346-1975
125.	04698 60	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848-1981	156.	06264 46	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 3903-1973
126.	04699 61	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848-1981					
127.	04700 37	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 1848-1981					

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
157.	06304 37	82-08-01	83-07-31	IS : 561-1978	187.	07223 41	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2653-1980
158.	06341 42	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 4174-1977	188.	07224 42	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2653-1980
159.	06368 53	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 564-1975	189.	07225 43	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5281-1979
160.	06381 50	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS : 4588-1977	190.	07229 47	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 737-1974
161.	06405 41	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 8028-1976	191.	07243 45	82-09-16	83-11-15	IS : 1161-1979
162.	06406 42	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 7285-1974	192.	07252 46	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 325-1978
163.	06435 47	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5430-1981	193.	07255 49	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 8487-1977
164.	06436 48	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 5086-1981	194.	07257 51	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 226-1975
165.	06441 45	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 427-1965	195.	07270 48	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 2906-1980
166.	06444 48	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 780-1980	196.	07310 39	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2339-1963
167.	06449 53	82-08-01	83-09-30	IS : 916-1975	197.	0731342	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 4654-1974
168.	06458 54	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4175-1981	198.	07395 60	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 4900-1969
169.	06471 51	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 398 (Part II)-1976	199.	07396 61	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2818 (Part II)-1971
170.	06473 53	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4894-1968	200.	07397 62	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2566-1965
171.	06476 56	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1222-1973	201.	07898 78	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS : 398 (Part II)-1976
172.	06482 54	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 6073-1971	202.	07993 76	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS : 1051-1980
173.	06483 55	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 5482-1969	203.	07995 78	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 722 (Part II)-1977
174.	06496 60	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2834-1981	204.	07997 80	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 6914-1978
175.	06500 39	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2566-1965	205.	08007 39	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1554 (Part I)-1976
176.	06516 47	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 561-1978	206.	08048 43	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 398 (Part I)-1976
177.	06530 43	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2580-1965	207.	08047 47	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 6595-1980
178.	06526 49	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 5557-1969	208.	08048 48	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 6914-1978
179.	06530 45	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2148-1968	209.	08050 42	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS : 8054-1976
180.	06532 47	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2448 (Part II)-1968	210.	08058 50	82-11-16	83-10-31	IS : 2074-1979
181.	06538 53	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 1239 (Part I)-1979	211.	08074 50	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 1554 (Part I)-1976
182.	06975 70	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2339-1963	212.	08077 53	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 4654-1974
183.	07141 40	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 7121-1973	213.	08083 51	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 2202 (Part I)-1973
184.	07181 48	82-09-01	83-05-31	IS : 2255-1977	214.	08091 51	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 8500-1979
185.	07195 54	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 2567-1978	215.	08091 51	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 8500-1979
186.	07222 46	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS : 2653-1980	216.	08091 51	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 8500-1979

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
216.	80123 42	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 5086-1969	255.	09079 59	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 5411 (Part I)—1977
217.	08159 54	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS : 4760-1968	256.	09086 58	82-11-16	83-12-31	IS: 158-1968
218.	08178 57	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943-1964	257.	09094 58	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 1370-1976
219.	08180 51	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943-1964	258.	09106 45	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 8391-1977
220.	08181 52	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 3794-1966	259.	09107 46	81-11-16	82-11-15	IS: 7406 (Part I)—1974
221.	08182 53	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943-1964	260.	09119 50	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 758-1975
222.	08200 38	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS : 7098 (Part II)—1973	261.	09120 43	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 758-1975
223.	08238 52	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2874-1964	262.	09125 48	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 2567-1978
224.	08239 53	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 3984-1967	263.	09130 45	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 565-1977
225.	08240 46	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943-1964	264.	09132 47	81-11-16	82-11-15	IS: 2566-1965
226.	08254 52	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 1943-1964	265.	09134 49	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 168-1973
227.	08303 44	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS: 1943-1964	266.	09169 60	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS: 1391-1971
228.	08317 50	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS: 1943-1964	267.	09916 71	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS: 3055 (Part I)—1977
229.	08391 60	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS: 1943-1964	268.	09927 74	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS: 398 (Part II)—1976
230.	08392 61	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS : 2874-1964	269.	09933 72	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS: 325-1978
231.	08643 61	82-05-01	83-04-30	IS : 6750-1972	270.	09934 73	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS: 7538-1975
232.	08778 75	81-12-01	82-11-30	IS: 2566-1965	271.	09942 73	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS: 1507-1977
233.	08856 72	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS: 6750-1972	272.	09971 78	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 8144-1976
234.	08861 69	82-08-16	83-08-15	IS: 428-1968	273.	09975 82	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 171-1973
235.	08928 71	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS- 1977-1975	274.	10004 09	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 4654-1974
236.	08941 68	82-09-16	83-09-15	IS: 8497-1977	275.	10005 10	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 4654-1974
237.	08953 72	82-09-01	83-08-31	IS: 10 (Part III)—1974	276.	10011 08	82-10-16	82-10-15	IS: 1786-1979
238.	08968 79	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 1786-1979	277.	10012 09	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 226-1975
239.	08970 73	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 8180-1976	278.	10013 10	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 398 (Part II)—1976
240.	08971 74	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 261-1966	279.	10015 12	82-11-01	84-03-31	IS: 1759-1980
241.	08973 76	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 1786-1979	280.	10016 13	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 691-1966
242.	08974 77	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 226-1975	281.	10024 13	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 260-1969
243.	08978 81	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 5672-1970	282.	10032 13	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 8448-1977
244.	08988 83	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 3589-1966	283.	10035 16	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 2653-1980
245.	08992 79	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 4654-1974	284.	10038 19	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 565-1975
246.	09001 37	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 562-1978	285.	10041 14	82-11-01	83-10-31	IS: 6750-1972
247.	09010 38	82-10-01	83-09-30	IS: 4497-1977	286.	10042 15	82-11-01	83-11-15	IS: 226-1975
248.	09018 46	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 1341-1976	287.	10053 18	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 2681-1979
249.	09021 41	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 1061-1975	288.	10056 21	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 2148-1968
250.	08024 44	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 398 (Part I & II)—1976	289.	10064 21	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 4654-1974
251.	07042 46	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 398 (Part II)—1976	290.	10069 26	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 1786-1979
252.	09047 51	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 7121-1973	291.	10075 24	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS- 335-1972
253.	09050 46	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 2653-1980	292.	10077 26	82-11-16	83-11-15	IS: 7121-1973
254.	09051 57	82-10-16	83-10-15	IS: 2653-1980	293.	10092 25	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS: 7406 (Part II)—1980
					294.	10111 11	81-12-01	83-11-30	IS: 2569-1978
					295.	10119 19	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS: 4766-1968
					296.	10120 12	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS: 4984-1978
					297.	10129 21	82-12-01	83-11-30	IS: 7122-1973

[No. CMD/13 : 12]

A.P. BANERJI, Addl. Director General

स्वास्थ्य और परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय**(स्वास्थ्य विभाग)**

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3019.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 14 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् से परामर्श करने के बाद एतद्वारा निर्देशित करती है कि मोनाश विश्वविद्यालय ऑस्ट्रेलिया द्वारा दी गयी "एम० बी० बी० एम०" चिकित्सा अर्हता उस अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए मान्य चिकित्सा अर्हता होगी।

[सं० बी० 11016/3/81-एम० ई० (पी)]

MINISTRY OF HEALTH & FAMILY WELFARE

(Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 3019.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consultation with the Medical Council of India, hereby directs that the medical qualification "M.B.B.S." granted by the Monash University, Australia, shall be a recognised medical qualification for the purposes of that Act.

[No. V. 11016/3/81-M.E.(P)]

का. आ. 3020.—भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् अधिनियम, 1956 (1956 का 102) की धारा 14 की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार भारतीय आयुर्विज्ञान परिषद् से परामर्श करने के बाद एतद्वारा निर्देशित करती है कि लागोस विश्वविद्यालय नाइजीरिया द्वारा दी गयी "एम. बी. बी. एम." चिकित्सा अर्हता उस अधिनियम के प्रयोजन के लिए मान्य चिकित्सा अर्हता होगी।

[सं० बी. 11016/5/82-एम. ई. (पी)]

पी० सी० जैन, अवर सचिव

S.O. 3020.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government, after consultation with the Medical Council of India, hereby directs that the medical qualification "M.B.B.S." granted by the University of Lagos, Nigeria, shall be a recognised medical qualification for the purposes of that Act.

[No. V. 11016/5/82 M.E. (P)]

P. C. JAIN, Under Secy.

सिंचाई मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 24 फरवरी, 1983

का०आ० 3021.—केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा राज-भाषा (संघ के सरकारी प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 462 GI/83—6

1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में, सिंचाई मंत्रालय के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिनके कर्म-चारीवृन्द ने हिंदी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

1. केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, मेवा भवन रामकृष्णपुरम, नई दिल्ली।
2. केन्द्रीय मृदा एवं सामग्री अनुसंधानशाला हौजबास, नई दिल्ली-16
3. गंगा बाढ़ नियंत्रण आयोग सिंचाई भवन तृतीय मंजिल, पटना-800015
4. सोन नदी आयोग 136 ए/डी श्री कृष्णपुरी, पटना-800013
5. माही नियंत्रण बोर्ड 9-पोलो ग्राउंड सहेली मार्ग, उदयपुर, (राजस्थान)।
6. बाणसागर नियंत्रण बोर्ड, रीवा (मध्य प्रदेश)।
7. सरदार सरोवर निर्माण सलाहकार समिति नर्मदा भवन, चतुर्थ मंजिल, इंदिरा एवन्यू रोड, बडोदरा (गुजरात)।

केन्द्रीय जल आयोग के अधीनस्थ कार्यालय :—

1. अन्वेषण सकल संख्या-एक केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, एन० एच० IV, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा)।
2. केन्द्रीय भंडार डिवीजन केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, पश्चिम ब्लाक-दो, रामकृष्णपुरम नई दिल्ली।
3. अन्वेषण सकल संख्या-दो, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, एन० एच० IV, फरीदाबाद (हरियाणा)।
4. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान सकल, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, सेवा भवन, नई दिल्ली।
5. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान डिवीजन, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, देहरादून (उ० प्र०)।
6. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान डिवीजन-दो केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, आगरा (उ० प्र०)।
7. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान डिवीजन-II केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, जयपुर (राजस्थान)।
8. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान सकल, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, वाराणसी (उ० प्र०)।
9. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान डिवीजन-I, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, लखनऊ (उ० प्र०)।
10. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान डिवीजन-दो, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, लखनऊ (उ० प्र०)।
11. जल संसाधन एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान डिवीजन, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, वाराणसी (उ० प्र०)।
12. प्रगति एवं विकास (पी० एण्ड डी०) यूनिट, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, मेवाभवन, रामकृष्णपुरम, नई दिल्ली।

13. गंगा बेसिन जल संसाधन संगठन, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, वसंत विहार, नई दिल्ली।
14. पंचेश्वर अन्वेषण डिवीजन-दो, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, पिथौरागढ़ (उ०प्र०)।
15. सूखा क्षेत्र अध्ययन डिवीजन-तीन केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, पुणे (महाराष्ट्र)।
16. पुणे गेजिंग डिवीजन, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, पुणे (महाराष्ट्र)।
17. केन्द्रीय बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान डिवीजन केन्द्रीय जल आयोग सूरत (गुजरात)।
18. जल-वैज्ञानिक प्रेक्षण एवं बाढ़ पूर्वानुमान सँकिल (दक्षिण), केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, हैदराबाद (आ० प्र०)।
19. चिनाब अन्वेषण सँकिल, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, जम्मू, (जम्मू और कश्मीर)।
20. चिनाब अन्वेषण डिवीजन, केन्द्रीय जल आयोग, जम्मू (जम्मू और कश्मीर)।

[सं० 1(3)/82-हिंदी]

कमल मोहन चड्ढा, निदेशक

7. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Division II, Central Water Commission, Jaipur (Rajasthan)
8. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Circle Central Water Commission, Varanasi (U.P.).
9. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Division-I, Central Water Commission, Lucknow (U.P.)
10. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Division-II, Central Water Commission, Lucknow (U.P.)
11. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Division, Central Water Commission, Varanasi (U.P.).
12. Progress & Development Unit, Central Water Commission, Sewa Bhawan, R. K. Puram, New Delhi.
13. Ganga Basin, Water Resources Organisation, Central Water Commission, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi.
14. Pancheshwar Investigation Division-II, Central Water Commission, Pithoragarh (U.P.)
15. Draught Area Study Division-III, Central Water Commission, Pune (Maharashtra).
16. Pune Gauging Division, Central Water Commission, Pune, (Maharashtra).
17. Central Flood Forecasting Division, Central Water Commission, Surat (Gujarat).
18. Hydrological Observation & Flood Forecasting Circle (South), Central Water Commission, Hyderabad (A.P.).
19. Chenab Investigation Circle, Central Water Commission, Jammu (J&K).
20. Chenab Investigation Division, Central Water Commission, Jammu (J&K).

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION

New Delhi, the 24th February, 1983

S.O. 3021.—In pursuance of Sub-rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the Ministry of Irrigation the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

1. Central Water Commission, Sewa Bhawan, R. K. Puram, New Delhi.
2. Central Soil & Material Research Station, Hauz Khas, New Delhi.
3. Ganga Flood Control Commission, Sinchai Bhawan, 3rd Floor, Patna-800015.
4. Sone River Commission, 136 A/D, Shrikrishnapuri, Patna-800013.
5. Mahi Control Board, 9-Folo Ground, Saheli Road, Udaipur, (Rajasthan).
6. Bansagar Control Board, Rewa (M.P.).
7. Sardyar Sarovar Construction Advisory Committee, Narmada Bhawan, 4th Floor, Indira Avenue Road, Vadodra (Gujarat).

Subordinate Officers of Central Water Commission :

1. Investigation Circle No. 1, Central Water Commission, NH-IV, Faridabad (Haryana).
2. Central Stores Division, Central Water Commission West Block-II, R. K. Puram, New Delhi.
3. Investigation Circle No. 2, Central Water Commission, NH-IV, Faridabad (Haryana).
4. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Circle, Central Water Commission, Sewa Bhawan, New Delhi.
5. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Division, Central Water Commission, Dehra Dun (U.P.).
6. Water Resources & Flood Forecasting Division II, Central Water Commission, Agra (U.P.).

[No. 1(3)/82-Hindi]

K. M. CHADHA, Director

नई दिल्ली, 16 जून, 1983

का० आ० 3022.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ब्रह्मपुत्र बोर्ड अधिनियम, 1980 (1980 का 46) की धारा 4 की उप-धारा (1) और (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के सिंचाई मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 926(अ) तारीख 28 दिसम्बर, 1981 का निम्नलिखित रूप में संशोधन करती है, अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना में “धारा 4 की उपधारा (3) के खंड (ग) के अधीन नियुक्त” शीर्षक के नीचे श्री एल० गोर चन्द्र शर्मा से संबंधित प्रविष्टि में, “अपर मुख्य इंजीनियर” शब्दों के स्थान पर “मुख्य इंजीनियर” शब्द रखे जाएंगे।

[सं० 1/81-बी०सी०/एफ०सी०]

सी० एस० हुकमानो, संयुक्त सचिव

New Delhi, the 16th June, 1983

S.O. 3022.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-sections (1) and (3) of section 4 of the Brahmaputra Board Act, 1980 (46 of 1980), the Central Government hereby amends and the Government of India, Ministry of Irrigation, Notification No. S.O. 926(E) dated the 28th December, 1981 as follows, namely :—

In the said notification, under the heading “Appointed under clause (c) of sub-section (3) of section 4,” in the entry relating to Shri L. Gourachandra Sharma, for words “Additional Chief Engineer”, the words “Chief Engineer” shall be substituted.

[No. 1/81-BC/FC]

C. S. HUKMANI, Jt. Secy.

संचार मंत्रालय

(डाक तार बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1983

क्र० आ० 3023:—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किये गये भारतिय तार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार महानिदेशक ने बंतवाल टेलीफोन केन्द्र में दिनांक 1-8-83 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निश्चय किया है।

[संख्या 5-13/83-पा० एच० बा०]

अ.र०सो० कटारिया,

सह.पा० महानिदेशक (पा०एच०बा०)

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P&T Board)

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1983

S.O. 3023.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specified 1-8-83 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Bantwal Telephone Exchange Karnataka Circle.

[No. 5-13/83-PHB]

R. C. KATARIA, Asstt. Director General (PHB).

MINISTRY OF LABOUR & REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour)

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1983

S.O. 3024.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bank of India, Calcutta, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th July, 1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
CALCUTTA

Reference No. 71 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employer in relation to the management of Bank of India, Calcutta.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh.—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employer.—Mr. K. K. Sarkar, Industrial Relations Officer.

On behalf of Workmen.—Mr. Amar Deo Singh, An Office-bearer of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Banking

AWARD

The dispute as to whether the action of the management in relation to Dobson Lane Branch, Calcutta of the Bank of India in imposing the punishment of stoppage of two increments against Shri Ashok Sen Gupta, Clerk under

Order dated 10-1-80 is justified and if not, to what extent the concerned workman Ashok Sen Gupta, was entitled to his annual increment by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour by their Order No. 1-12012/303/81-M. L.(A) dated 23 November 1982, for adjudication.

2. The admitted facts in this instant case are that the concerned workman Ashok Sen Gupta, a clerk of the bank of India made interpolation in the bank's doctor's prescription dated 6 March 1978 (Ext. M-1) by inserting item No. 4 Selsum Shampoo therein and submitted a medical bill on 19 March 1978 for reimbursement of Rs. 33.25 P. The cost of the shampoo was Rs. 9.25 only. Admittedly he was entitled to medicine if prescribed by the bank's doctor upto the value of Rs. 150 per year. In this case the doctor had prescribed only three medicines, Benadryl, Rapsovin and Neogudin. Subsequently he made interpolation in the said prescription and inserted item 'Selsum Shampoo'. According to the bank, the act of Sen Gupta constituted gross misconduct in terms of clause 19(5)(j) of the First Bipartite Settlement, it being an act prejudicial to the interest of the bank. Sri Sen Gupta said that his sister who had gone to purchase the medicine may have written the name of selsum Shampoo in the prescription and that he inadvertently produced the bill for reimbursement. In other words he pleaded bonafide mistake. In view of the unclear admission of guilt the bank held enquiry on 14 May 1979 through Sri S. K. Ghosh who found Sen Gupta guilty of interpolation by his report dated 12 July 1979 and punished him by stopping him two increments on 11 December 1979. Mr. A. D. Singh has not challenged the fairness or validity of the domestic enquiry. So the enquiry has to be held fair and valid. He has however challenged the authority of the Enquiry Officer to impose the punishment. The departmental appeal of Sri Sen Gupta was rejected by the appellate officer by order dated 1 April 1980.

3. Mr. A. D. Singh an officer-bearer of the Union appearing the concerned workman, namely Sen Gupta, firstly, contended that the act of Ashok Sen Gupta did not constitute gross misconduct within the meaning of clause 19(5)(j) of the bipartite settlement of 1966. On the other hand Sri K. K. Sarkar, the Industrial Relations Officer appearing for the bank argued that it was a deliberate dishonest act which was fully covered by clause 19(5)(j) of the said settlement. I think, Mr. K. K. Sarkar is right. The concession was certainly abused by Sri Sen Gupta. The act of insertion of the shampoo could not be an act of inadvertence. It was a wilful act of an attempt to cheat the bank and it was most improper. Though it was not a major fault, it was an act prejudicial to the interest of the bank and therefore a gross misconduct. The contention of the Union is accordingly rejected.

4. Mr. A. K. Singh for the Union next urged that in the chargesheet (Ext. M-1 collectively) dated 16 April 1979 the punishment proposed was stoppage of only one increment by the Assistant General Manager but the Enquiry Officer imposed the punishment of stoppage of two increments permanently and this was unjust. In my opinion the contention is valid. In view of the fact that in the chargesheet only one increment was proposed to be stopped and having regard to the circumstances of the case and to the fact that the fault is minor, I am of the opinion that Sri Sen Gupta should not be punished heavily and that stoppage of only one increment permanently would meet the ends of justice. I therefore reduce the punishment to the stoppage of only one increment. The excess punishment is set aside. The result will be that only the increment which Sri Sen Gupta was to draw on 9 May 1980 will be stopped. He will be entitled to draw his increment along with his basic salary from 9 May 1981 onwards.

5. It was next submitted by the union that Enquiry Officer had no power to impose punishment because he was not the disciplinary authority. The contention has no merit because Ext. W-1 the notice itself shows that Sri S. K. Chakraborty, the General Manager had empowered the Enquiry Officer to award punishment. Mr. A. K. Singh for the Union has not shown that such delegation of power is barred by the provisions of bipartite settlement or by Sastri Award or by any other award. I accordingly hold

that the Enquiry Officer had power to punish in exercise of the power validly given to him by the General Manager. The point, thus, has no force.

6. In sum, my concluded award is that the action of the management in relation to Dobson Lane Branch, Calcutta of the Bank of India in imposing the punishment of stoppage of two increments against Sri Ashok Sen Gupta, clerk under order dated 16 January 1980 is not justified to that extent. It can be justified only to the extent of imposing the punishment of stoppage of one increment only which he was to draw on 9 May 1980 and I justify the punishment to this extent only. It follows that Sri Ashok Sen Gupta the concerned workman will be entitled to draw his increment along with his basic salary from 9 May 1981 onwards.

Dated, Calcutta,
The 1st July 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-12012(363)/81-D. II. A]

S.O. 3025.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Syndicate Bank, New Delhi, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 8-7-1983.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SINGLA: PRESIDING OFFICER
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 71 of 1980

In the matter of dispute between

Smt. Bina Devi

Ex-Sweepers, Syndicate Bank.

I.P. Estate Branch, N. Delhi.

AND

Syndicate Bank,

I.P. Estate, Bahadur Shah Zaffar Marg,
New Delhi.

PRESENT:

Shri M. S. Dewan for the Management Smt. Bina Devi,
with Mr. C. L. Bhardwaj and Shri Anoop Kumar.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, on 14th July, 1980, vide Order No. L-12012/36/80-D.II.A., made the reference of the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

“Whether the action of the management of Syndicate Bank in relation to their I.P. Estate Branch, New Delhi in terminating the services of Smt. Bina Devi Sweepers with effect from 20-2-1979 on the plea of her alleged voluntary resignation is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

2. The matter has been settled voluntarily between the parties and the Management has offered a fresh appointment to Mrs. Bina Devi without payment of any back wages and at a scale of 1/3rd of Attenders and the place of posting is to be decided by the Management and the offer is made on humanitarian grounds. Smt. Bina Devi has agreed to all these terms and conditions and accordingly, an award in terms and conditions offered by the Management

is made and she will be given appointment by the Syndicate Bank in terms of the terms and conditions offered by the Bank and accepted by Smt. Bina Devi and indicated earlier.

Dated: July 1, 1983.

O. P. SINGLA, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-12012(36)/80-D.II.A]

S.O. 3026.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Allahabad Bank, Kanpur, and their workman, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th July, 1983.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SINGLA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE,
NEW DELHI

I.D. No. 10/81

In the matter of disputes between:

Shri Nand Kishore
son of late Shri Ram Prasad
resident of 124/127 'B'
Govind Nagar, Kanpur.

AND

The Allahabad Bank, Kanpur.

PRESENT:

Shri V. V. Mangalvedekar for the Workman
Shri Rajiv for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, on 15th January, 1981, vide Order No. L-12012(110)/80-D.II(A), made the reference of the following dispute to the Tribunal for adjudication:—

“Whether the action of the management of Allahabad Bank in not absorbing Shri Nand Kishore—Subordinate Staff in the Bank services and in terminating the services from April, 1980 is fair, just and legal? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?”

2. A settlement reached between the workman and the Management has been filed and also filed is the affidavit of the workman, Nand Kishore that in view of settlement between the All India Allahabad Bank Employees Coordination Committee and the Management of Allahabad Bank dated 13th May, 1982, he has been permanently absorbed in the service of the Bank since 16-4-1983 and did not claim any back wages and he did not press the dispute pending before this Tribunal on account of the settlement and acceptance of service in the Bank.

3. Shri V. V. Mangalvedekar has no instruction from the workman and the photo copies of the affidavit and settlement filed by the Management are accepted by him and accordingly, a ‘No dispute Award’ is made.

Dated, July 2, 1983.

O. P. SINGLA, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-12012/110/80-D.II.A.]
N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer.

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1983

S.O. 3027.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Parbelia Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Nuturia, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 66/82

PRESENT:

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Parbelia Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Puturia (Burdwan).

AND

Their workman

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Sri B. N. Lala, Advocate.

For the Workman—Sri P. N. Ojha, Secretary of the Union.

INDUSTRY : Coal

STATE : West Bengal

Dated, the 1st July, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-19012 (42)/82-D.IV(B) dated the 15th July, 1982.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Parbelia Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Puturia, Dist. Burdwan in not regularising Shri Jayram Paswan as Tipping Truck Driver in Cat. V with effect from 24-7-80 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

2. On 21-6-1983 both the parties have filed a joint petition of compromise duly signed by both the parties with a prayer to pass an award in terms of the settlement.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement which is beneficial for the workman.

4. In the circumstances the award is passed in terms of the settlement which shall form part of the award.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer

BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
NO. 3, DHANBAD

In the matter of Reference No. 66 of 1982

PARTIES

Employers in relation to the management of Parbelia Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd.

AND

Their workmen

Joint petition of compromise:

The humble petition of both the parties herein concerned most respectfully sheweth:

1. That the above matter is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal and the matter has not yet been heard.

2. That both the parties, in the meantime, discussed the instant matter mutually and the instant matter is settled on the following terms:—

(i) That both the parties agree that the workman concerned who was promoted to Category-V as Driver with effect from 5-3-82 is in order.

ii) That the management agrees that the workman concerned will be given one increment on his existing Basic pay as on 1-2-83 and the Basic pay thus increased will be effective on and from 1-2-83.

(iii) That both the parties agree that as against the claim of the workmen for any back wages whatsoever for any period prior to 5-3-82 arising out of instant order of reference, the payment by the management to the concerned workman of the amount equivalent to the sum being the fifty per cent of the difference between the initial basic pay of Category-V and the actual basic pay paid to the concerned workman during the period from 24-10-80 to 4-3-82, shall be deemed to be fully and finally settled.

(iv) That the management agrees to pay the total consolidated sum as stated in the foregoing paragraph within a period of three months from the date this settlement is accepted by the Hon'ble Tribunal.

(v) That both the parties agree that by this settlement the instant matter and all or any matter arising out of the instant order of reference stand fully and finally settled and that the aforesaid terms are fair and proper.

3. That both the parties pray that the Hon'ble tribunal may be pleased to accept the settlement as fair and proper and may be further please to pass an award in terms of the settlement.

And for this act of kindness, both the parties, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

For and on behalf of the workmen.

For and on behalf of the Employers.

Sd/-

{No. L-19012(42)/82-D-IV(B)}

S.O. 3028.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Jaykaynagar (Burdwan) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 45/82

PRESENT:

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Jaykaynagar Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Jaykaynagar (Burdwan).

AND

Their workmen

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri J. B. Banerjee, Asstt, Secretary, of the Union.

INDUSTRY : Coal

STATE : West Bengal

Dated, the 1st July, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-19012 (31)/82-D.IV(B) dated the 17th May, 1982.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workmen for placing Shri Chando Bouri and 13 others, Timber Mazdoors of Jaykaynagar Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Jaykaynagar (Burdwan) in Cat. III with retrospective effect is justified? If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

2. The case of the workmen concerned is that they were originally Timber Mazdoors and were actually in Category III workers who were being paid wages of Category II instead of Category III and it is only from 11-11-1980 that they are getting the wages of Category III. It is submitted that the Jaykaynagar Colliery consists of two Seams viz. Bogra seam and Satgram seam and there has been no change in their working conditions. Their prayer is that they should be paid Category III wages since the date of nationalisation till 10-11-1980 as admittedly they are getting Category III wages on and from 11-11-1980.

3. The case of the management is that the present Reference is not maintainable as no such demand was ever made before the management either by the workmen concerned or by the sponsoring union and no dispute was ever raised before them. It is further stated that according to the Coal Wage Board Recommendation Timber Mazdoors are in Category II & III and in Category III are only those mazdoors who assist the timber or setting Mistry in setting timber props of 10 ft. and above and the same category is continuing even after the implementation of N.C.W.W.A-I & II

4. It is stated that Jaykaynagar Colliery has 2 Seams viz. Satgram seam which has a thickness of 14 ft. and Bogra seam which has a thickness of 9 ft. The work started in Satgram seam in October 2 '77 and the operation of mining was confined to a height of 8 ft. only because this particular seam is just below the Jaykaynagar Aluminium Factory and the impending damage to the factory was kept in consideration and hence work was confined to 8 ft. only. But in November '80 the roof blasting above 8 ft. started when the mining operation crossed beyond the Aluminium Factory. As regards Bogra seam it is stated that its thickness is only 9 ft. and therefore there was no question of height of the galleries being more than 9 ft. It is further stated that when the height of the gallery exceeded 10 ft. from November 80 props of a length of 10 ft. had to be used and therefore from 11-11-1980 the concerned workmen were being given Category III and they are getting wages of the said category. It is submitted that prior to the said date there was no question of any operation beyond 8 ft. and so the concerned workmen were rightly paid wages of Category II prior to 11-11-1980.

5. The point for consideration is as to whether the demand of the workmen for placing Sri Chando Bouri and 13 others, Timber Mazdoors of Jaykaynagar Colliery in Category III with retrospective effect is justified. If so, to what relief the workmen concerned are entitled.

6. Both the sides have examined one witness each in support of their respective cases. No document has been filed on behalf of either side. It will appear from the Coal Wage Board Recommendation Vol. 2, Appendix V, pages 43 and 44 that Timber Mazdoors have been placed both in Category II & III. Their job description is also given. A Timber Mazdoor in Category III is one who assist the timber or setting Mistry in setting timber props of 10 ft. and above. According to the management this 10 ft. height was made only in November '80 when the operation of the mine went beyond the Aluminium Factory situated on the surface. MW-1 is Sri R. Bose, Superintendent of Jaykaynagar Colliery who is working there since 1971 as Asstt. Manager, general manager and superintendent of mines. He has stated that Timber Mazdoors according to Wage Board recommendations are placed in Category II & III and that the mazdoors handling props upto 10 ft and above are alone in Category II. He has stated that Bogra Seam is only 10 ft. thick and therefore they are working upto 6-7 ft. Satgram seam is 14 ft. thick and work started here in October '77 and intially upto 1980 they worked started here in only because they were working below the Jaykaynagar Aluminium Factory and because of danger of cracks etc.

they could not go high. He has further stated that as the concerned workmen were working upto a height of 8 ft. only, hence as per Coal Wage Board Recommendation they were paid Category II wages, but the moment the work started upto 10 ft. and above they were paid Category III wages. Admittedly the concerned workmen are getting Category III wages since 11-11-1980.

7. As against this WW-1 has stated that they fit different sizes of timber as required. In his chief he has no where stated that he or any of the workmen ever worked upto a height of 10 ft. and above prior to 10-11-80. Thus there is no evidence on behalf of the workmen to prove that they were working beyond 10 ft. but were paid wages Category II only.

8. It will also appear that unless demand and dispute is raised before the management, there can be no industrial dispute under the Industrial Disputes Act. It is the definite contention of the management that no such demand was ever made before them nor any such dispute was raised. MW-1 has categorically stated about it. The workman WW-1 on the other hand in his cross-examination has stated that he has got copies of the representations made by them before the management. But no such copy has been filed. Thus there is no document on behalf of the union to show that ever any demand was made before the management. It may also be stated that the union after examining their witness did not come to cross-examine the management witness or argue of the case.

9. Considering the evidence on record. I hold that the demand of the workmen as mentioned in the schedule of Reference is not justified and they are not entitled to any relief.

10. The award is given accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-19012(31)/82-D.IV(B)]

New Delhi, the 11th July, 1983

S.O. 3029.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Bhanora Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Charanpur (Burdwan) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 24/82

PRESENT :

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Bhanora Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Charanpur (Burdwan)

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri N. Das, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. Yar Mohamad, Organising Secretary.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

STATE : West Bengal.

Dated the 1st July, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-19012 (81)/81-D.IV(B) dated the 20-3-1982.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the Agent, Bhanora Colliery, M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Charanpur (Burdwan) in deducting 8 days wages from wage bill of May, '80 in respect of 16 workmen is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?"

2. The concerned workmen are under ground loaders working in Kotha East Section of Bhanora Colliery under Eastern Coalfields Ltd. Their case is that they are permanent employees under the management having more than 15 years of service to their credit. It is then alleged that they had been continuously working for more than 5 months without being allowed to avail any rest as a consequence of which their health was badly affected because of strain and fatigue. They sent intimation to the Manager of the colliery on 27-5-80 of their intention of being allowed to avail rest on 28-5-80. No response was made by the management and the concerned workmen went to the colliery again on 28-5-80 to make their representation. Their attendance was recorded in second shift of that day and the Manager compelled them to work as it was production month. But the concerned workmen who were tired could not go down the pit. It is alleged that as they did not work in the second shift of 28-5-80 their wages for 8 days were deducted U/S 9 of the Payment of Wages Act. It is submitted that the said action is unjustified and illegal. The allegation of the management that they had gone on strike on that day has been denied. It is proved that they should be paid 8 days wages which has been deducted from their wage bill of May, 1980.

3. The defence of the management is that for any deduction under the Payment of Wages Act the proper forum for the concerned workmen was the Payment of Wages Court and not the Industrial Tribunal as the case does not come under the Industrial Disputes Act. The locus-standi of the union has also been challenged.

4. On merits the case of the management is that the concerned workmen who are underground loaders had their duties in Kotha East Section of Bhanora Pit in the second shift of 28-5-80 and though the concerned workmen along with 4 others reported for their duty in the said shift got their attendance booked and received cap lamps from the lamp cabin but acting in concert with one another absented themselves from their place of work without any notice and without reasonable cause and so they made themselves liable for action U/S 9 of the Payment of Wages Act. The management, therefore, took a decision for deducting their 8 days wages under the said Act which is legal and justified. The said absence was treated by the management as a strike and a notice in Form N under Industrial Disputes Rules was sent to all the authorities on 29-5-80. The grievance of the workmen that they were not given any weekly day rest has been denied. It is also denied that they even approached the Manager either on 27-5-80 or 28-5-80 for allowing them to avail rest. It is submitted that if any such rest was actually required by them there was no necessity for getting their attendance recorded in the second shift and received cap lamps.

5. On the above grounds it is prayed that the Reference decided in favour of the management.

6. The point for consideration is as to whether the action of the management in deducting 8 days wages from the wage bill of May '80 in respect of 16 workmen is justified. If not, to what relief they are entitled.

7. None of the workmen has come to depose in this case in support of their case. It is admitted in the written statement that their attendance was recorded in the second shift of 28-5-80 and cap lamps were issued to them but they did not go underground to resume their duty. The contention of the workmen is that as they were tired and fatigued they sent intimation to the management on 27-5-80 of their intention to avail rest and they also went to the colliery on 28-5-80 and made such request. But this fact has totally been denied on behalf of the management. There is nothing in writing to show that ever such a prayer was made on behalf of any of the concerned workmen. MW-1 is the Sr. Personnel Officer of Bhanora Colliery and he has stated that the wages were deducted as the concerned workmen participated in an illegal strike and resorted to demonstrations. Now if the concerned workmen wanted to avail rest on 28-5-80 they should have made such a prayer in writing and would have applied for leave but no such action was taken by them. Further if they did not want to work then they should not have got their attendance marked and receive cap lamps. Cap lamps are issued only after taking signature of the workman and receipt of cap lamp clearly indicate that they received the same for the purpose of joining their duty in the second shift of that day. Further it is not expected that all the 16 underground loaders would have felt fatigued on the same day in the same shift. The matter would have been otherwise if one or two of them would have taken such step. From the circumstances it is clear that all of them in concert and collusion with one another after getting their attendance marked and receiving cap lamps refused to go underground.

8. Further it will appear that on the same day the management issued a notice Ext. M-1 mentioning that the concerned workmen had resorted to strike from the second shift of 28-5-80 without any notice as required U/S 22 of the Industrial Disputes Act and as such the above strike was illegal. On the same day the management issued an appeal to the workers (Ext. M-2) informing that it was an illegal strike and so they should join their duties immediately otherwise their 8 days wages will be deducted U/S 9 of the Payment of Wages Act, but no heed was paid to this appeal also. Ext. M-3 is the report in Form N under Rule 17 of the Industrial Disputes Rules sent to the A.L.C. and other authorities.

9. On 29-5-80 the management sent a notice to all the concern workmen informing them that for this illegal strike their 8 days wages had been deducted under the provisions of Section 9 of Payment of Wages Act. Ext. M-5 would show that there was some demonstration also by the union. Ext. M-6 is the letter sent by the management on 3-6-80 to the A.L.C. informing him about the deduction of the wages U/S 9 of the Payment of Wages Act. Ext. M-7 is another notice dated 4-6-80. All these documents clearly indicate that the concerned workmen in a body absented themselves from work in the second shift of 28-5-80. The aforesaid action of the workmen, therefore, cannot be said to be legal or justified. Ext. M-8 series are the representations filed by the workmen against deduction of 8 days wages.

10. It is, therefore, to be seen as to whether the said deduction is justified and legal or not. The proviso to Section 9, Sub-section (2) of the Payment of Wages Act which deals with deductions for absence from duty provides that subject to any rules made in this by the State Government if 10 or more employed persons acting in concert absent themselves without due notice and without reasonable cause, such deduction from any such person may include such amount not exceeding his wages for 8 days as may be any such terms be due to the employer in lieu of due notice and the explanation says that an employed person shall be deemed to be absent from the place where he is required to work if although present in such place he refuses in pursuance of a stay in strike or for any other cause which is not reasonable in the circumstances to carry out his work. In this particular case it is admitted that the concerned workmen after their attendance and receipt of cap lamps absented from the place where they were required to work.

11. It was however contended on behalf of the workmen that the proviso shows that this deduction is to be made subject to any rules made in this behalf by the State Govt. But in my opinion the rules made by the State Govt. will not be applicable as the colliery is the mine and the rules framed by the Central Government will only be applicable. This will be evident from Section 24 of the Payment of Wages Act which says that the powers by this Act conferred upon the State Govt. shall in relation to Railways, Air Transport services, Mines and Oilfields be powers of the Central Government. On the basis of this section the Central Government has framed rules which is known as Payment of Wages (Mines) Rules, 1956. Section 2(e) of this rule has defined the term deduction for breach of contract which means a deduction made in accordance with the provisions of the proviso to Sub-section (2) of Section 9. Rule 16 provides the procedure under which such deduction is to be made. There is nothing to show that the procedure as provided under Rule 16 of this Rule was not followed by the management. Thus considering the evidence and law points on the subject, I hold that the deduction of 8 days wages by the management in this case was legal and justified.

12. It will also appear that the present action of the management came under the provisions of the Payment of Wages Act and the proper course for the workmen was to seek remedy from the Payment of Wages Court and not from the Tribunal.

13. Considering the entire evidence on the record, I hold that the action of the management in deducting 8 days wages is legal and justified and hence the concerned workmen are not entitled to any relief.

14. It may however be mentioned that during the course of argument the representative of the union filed before me a copy of proceeding dated 24-4-82 which has been marked Ext. W-1 on formal proof. It relates to the different demands of the workmen of the said colliery and Point No. 8 of the minutes of the meeting relates to demand No. 11 and it was agreed that where 8 days wages or any other wages had been deducted that will be discussed with the Director (Corporate Planning & Project) and settled and paid by 20th May, 1982. In view of this decision, I think it will be desirable for the management to pay the wages of 8 days to the concerned workmen although this deduction has been found to be legal and justified. The management should take this attitude in order to maintain industrial peace and harmony in the Industry.

15. I give my award accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. L-19012(81)/81-D.IV(B)]

S.O. 3030.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sitarampur Sub-Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Sitarampur, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th July, 1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL.

CALCUTTA

Reference No. 56 of 1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Sitarampur Sub-Area of Eastern Coalfields Ltd.

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Mr. B. Gupta, Counsel, with Mr. M. N. Kar, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Mr. P Das Gupta, Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal.

AWARD

The Government of India Ministry of Labour, by their Order No. L-19012(45)/76-D.III(B)/D.IV5(B) dated 29th May, 1978 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Sitarampur Sub-Area of Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Sitarampur, District Burdwan in terminating the services of S/Shri Sovan, Explosive Carrier, Narayan Chowdhury, Boiler Fireman, Satis Ch. Mondal, Loading Clerk, Gora Chand Majhee, Store Mazdoor of Bejdih Colliery, Thakur Das, Driller of Poldih Colliery and Motilal Bouri, Khalasi of Mithani Colliery with effect from 1-1-1976, is justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workman entitled?"

2. Out of the above, Sovan, the Explosive Carrier died before the reference. Another workman Narayan Chowdhury, the Boiler Fireman was reinstated after he was declared fit by the Appellant Medical Board. So this reference has become infructuous in respect of these two workmen. Satis Chandra Mondal, a Loading Clerk died after giving evidence before this Tribunal. Gora Chand Majhee, a Store Mazdoor is alive and he has examined himself as WW 2. Thakur Das, a driller died after giving evidence before this Tribunal. Motilal Bouri, Fan Engine Khalasi is alive. Thus only two persons, namely Gora Chand Majhee and Motilal Bouri are alive at present.

3. After taking over the colliery in 1973 the management found that chaotic conditions were prevailing in the collieries and they were receiving reports from supervisory staff and Managerial staff that some workmen were not capable of discharging their normal duties due to continued ill health and physical incapability. The problem was subsequently discussed with higher authorities and it was ultimately decided to send such cases to Medical Board. Accordingly many workmen including the six of this case were medically examined (vide MW 2, M M P Karan). MW 4 A. K. Mathur, the Deputy Materials Manager has also deposed that absolute physical fitness was needed to perform a particular job because if a man is unfit, he may endanger the life of other workmen also working in that particular colliery. Thus the concerned workmen were medically examined and were found unfit and their services were terminated with effect from 1 January, 1976 on the ground of unfitness due to their continued ill-health as found by the doctors (See MW-1 and 3). The Medical Board was constituted consisting of Dr. S. K. Dey, Dr. K C Chatterjee and Dr. Mrs. Sharma (vide Ext M6 dated 11 October, 1975). On medical examination in November, 1975 Motilal Bouri was found to be above 60 years, his weight was 43 Kgs. He was found suffering from general debility, blood pressure (180 x 100), defective vision and hypertension. His general condition was very poor. Expansion of chest was nil. He was declared unfit for duty. Satis Chandra Mondal, the loading clerk was also above 60 years. He was found suffering from general debility, defective vision, hypertension and very high blood pressure. He was also found unfit. The medical reports of Motilal Bouri, Thakur Das, Satis Chandra Mondal Gora Chand Majhee are exhibits MW. M4(a), M4(d) and M4(e). On representation the concerned workmen were again medically examined by the Appellate Medical Board consisting of MW3 Dr. P. P. Bhattacharya, Dr. A. K. Sen and Dr. C. R. Mubata and one nominee viz. Mr. Murthy of the

Chief Personnel Officer. This is the highest medical authority in the E.C.L. As regards Thakur Das the Board found : (i) general condition poor, (ii) blood pressure 220/90 mm, (iii) pulse 120 per minute, (iv) cataract in both eyes with poor vision, (v) presystole murmur, active hypertension and persistent tachycardia with an enlarged heart. The report is mentioned in Ext. M20. The doctor has said that the nature of duty of Thakur Das was drilling and he was unfit for the job. Motilal Bouri, the fan khalasi was also examined on 22 March, 1978. The findings in his case also are poor general condition, high blood pressure, left ventricular hypertrophy and hypertension, old age, general debility, not good vision. The doctor (MW 3) has deposed that Fan Khalasi has to work in a very dangerous place where there are many moving machineries like conveyor belt, running motor and there is continuous dust and high velocity of air in his working atmosphere. Motilal Bouri was considered unfit for continuing with the job. The results of the examination of Motilal Bouri is recorded in Ext. M21.

The positive finding of Gora Chand Majheer, the Store Mazdoor for unfitness are poor general condition, poor vision including both eye-cataract, general debility and old age. Gora Chand was a heavy duty worker because he had to handle the materials of different weights for loading and unloading, also for putting them in racks and bins. The relevant report is Ext. M-22. He was declared unfit vide letter Ext. M-12 also. The positive finding of Satish Chandra Mondal the loading clerk are recorded in Ext. M23. He was declared unfit because of general debility, hypertension, 220 x 120 mm of mercury with LVH, pulse 10 per minute and cataract in both eyes with poor vision. As a loading clerk his duty was to record the loading and unloading, coal despatches, for examining the quality of coal he had to climb up the wagons and loaded trucks.

4. MW3, P. P. Bhattacharya is a Senior Medical Officer. He was one of the members of the appellate medical board. The consolidated report of the persons examined by the Board on 22 March, 1978 at 4 p.m. is Ext. M-24. In this report Sl. No. 3 is Gorachand Majheer, Sl. No. 4 is S. C. Mondal, Sl. No. 5 is Thakur Das and Sl. No. 6 is Motilal Bouri. In cross-examination he said that he was M.B.B.S. (Cal.), DPH (Cal) and DPH (Cal). It was taken from him in cross-examination that he was not an eye-specialist. In my opinion this is not a ground to reject the reports of the appellate medical board. MW 3 has said, "We are competent enough to conduct the medical examinations". I see no reason to disbelieve him. It is quite clear that on medical examination all these four persons viz. Thakur Das, Motilal Bouri, Gora Chand Majheer and S. C. Mondal were found unfit for continuing with their jobs. If so, they could not be allowed to perform their jobs at the risk of their life and at the risk of endangering the lives of other workers working in the particular colliery.

5. Four witnesses were examined by the Union on 4-8-1981. Thakur Das gave his age as 60. He admitted that he was examined by the doctor but he says that he was told that he was suffering from T.B. In cross-examination he denies that he was examined twice. He cannot be believed in face of the evidence of the two doctors (MW 1 and MW 3) who examined him. He is unreliable. It may be noticed that he died after giving evidence here. This supports the case of the management that he was suffering from continued ill-health. Gora Chand Majheer (WW 2) gave his age as 60 years. His evidence is that the doctors told him that he was alright and to go back. Obviously he is telling a lie. The appellate medical board examined him. His medical report is Ext. M22. In the consolidated medical report (Ext. M 24), his Sl. No. is 3. So this witness is a liar. WW 3 S. C. Mondal gave his age as 57. He says that he was not examined by the doctor. He is also a liar. The medical report of the appellate medical board in his case is Ext. M23. In the consolidated medical report (Ex M-24) his Sl. No. is 4. So he is a liar I see no reason to disbelieve the doctors or their reports. The last witness of the union is P. Mondal, the Vice President of the Union. He came to depose that he was not aware of any case where the service of any employee was terminated on medical grounds. So his evidence is useless. It may be stated here that the management has filed documents before this Tribunal to show that even the erstwhile management of

Equitable Coal Co. Ltd. had terminated the services of some workmen in 1970 and 1971 on medical grounds : See Exts. M25, M26, M27 and M28.

6. The management filed the service cards of the concerned workmen, Gora, Satish, Motilal and Thakur Das which are Exts. M-1/a, M-1/c, M-1/d and M-1/e respectively. They appear to have been filed for the purpose of showing that they were old. The doctors have already found them old and suffering from various diseases.

7. It was argued by Sri Das Gupta, appearing for the Union that MW 1 Dr. Mrs. Bharti Sharma was not an eye-specialist or heart specialist and hence she was incompetent to examine the workmen. I do not agree. She has said in her evidence that as MBBS, basic medical science she knew about eye also. She is MBBS, DDO(Cal) and DRCOG (London). A fantastic suggestion was made that she had not examined any of the workmen. The medical reports Ext. M-4 series have been signed by her, by Dr. S. K. Dey and Dr. K. C. Chatterjee. The latter two have retired. The contention is rejected.

8. It was next urged that there was no provision for termination of service in the standing orders for the Coal Mining Industry (Ext. W-1) on medical grounds. Suffice to say that this contention is without any substance. Even if there is no such provision in the standing orders, the management in my opinion has every right to remove an employee from service if the employee is incapable of doing active duty due to continued ill-health. Every contract of employment carries with it the implied term that the employee shall work and the employer shall pay. Where for medical reasons an employee becomes unfit for work, there is frustration of the contract of employment leading to the discharge from service. In *Burrahar Coal Co. v Azimuddin Ashraff*, 1960(2) LLJ 228 DB (Pat.) it was held that infirmity on account of old age incapacitating a workman from future work for an indefinite period meant continued ill-health and termination of service on this ground comes within the exception provided in clause (c), Section 2(oo) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It was observed that such a person does not possess sound health for active duties. In such case termination of service was held to be retrenchment. In *workmen of Bangalore Woollen, Cotton and Silk Mills Co. Ltd. v Its Management*, 1962 (1) LLJ 213 (SC) it was observed at page 217 :

"Where, therefore, a workman is discharged on the ground of ill-health, it is because he was unfit to discharge the service which he had undertaken to render and therefore it had really come to an end itself."

It was also held by the Supreme Court that such persons cannot be said to have been retrenched. In *Spencer & Co., Ltd. v Industrial Tribunal* 1965 (2) LLJ 1 (Mysore) it was observed that it would be unnatural to expect any employer to continue employee who is declared unfit for service on medical ground to permit him or compel him to discharge his duties. In my opinion termination of service on ground of continued ill-health is not only an implied term of contract but it is also contemplated in Industrial Disputes Act in the definition of retrenchment. Apart from this, it is a wisdom for all time and for all kinds of services. The point thus, has no force.

9. It was next submitted that the reports of appellate medical board were vitiated because one Mr. Murthy was present there to dictate the doctors to recommend termination of service on medical ground. The argument is baseless. MW 3, Dr. P. P. Bhattacharya, has deposed, "Mr. Murthy is not a medical man, how can he dictate". It may be noted that Mr. Murthy was a member of the medical board. He was the representative of the Chief Personnel Officer. He was there to see whether the person who appeared before the board was a bonafide and genuine employee, to verify the official record and to see other official matters. He sat there as a nominee of Chief Personnel Officer. He was not an unauthorised person in the medical board. There is no material on record to show that Mr. Murthy did anything to

influence the doctor. As already stated, he was a member of the board. The contention, thus, has no force.

10. It was next contended by Sri Das Gupta appearing for the workmen that the medical chits marked XI and X2 for identification go to show that Gora and Moti were found fit by the doctors of L.M. Hospital, Asansol. These chits purport to have been issued from the office of the Superintendent, Sub-divisional Hospital, Asansol signed by three medical officers on 22 November, 1976. It is not known how that medical board was constituted. None of those doctors from Asansol has come to support these chits. No one from the hospital has identified their signatures. As deposed by MW 2 P. P. Bhattacharya in his cross-examination, this is not a detailed examination report, not a complete certificate and not acceptable. In the circumstances I do not rely upon them.

11. It was further argued by Sri Das Gupta that 'retrenchment' as defined in the West Bengal Industrial Rules does not contain any clause like 'continued ill-health' and hence continued ill-health is no ground for termination of service. Suffice to say that this tribunal is bound to follow the Central Act, that is, Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The contention is rejected.

12. It was next submitted that Section 9A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 was not complied with. The argument is devoid of any merit. When service is terminated on ground of unfitness due to continued ill-health, it does not amount to any change in the conditions of service. Section 9A, therefore, has no application. The contention is rejected.

13. It was next submitted that the provisions of Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 were not complied with. In my opinion the contention has no merit because termination of service on ground of continued ill-health is not retrenchment.

14. It was next argued that natural justice was breached because the concerned workmen were not given opportunity to be heard after medical examination. The argument has no merit. It was on representation of the workmen and of the Union that they were medically examined by appellate medical board. So natural justice was observed. It has long been settled law that natural justice cannot be prettified or fitted into rigid moulds. They are applicable and turn on the facts and circumstances of each case; See *Sree Krishnadas Tikara v. State Government of Madhya Pradesh*, 1977 SCJ 276. Here there has been no unfair deal by the management. It may be noted that Narayan Chandra Chowdhury was declared unfit in the first medical examination but was found fit by the appellate medical board and he was reinstated. There has been several cases of this type. It is clear that none of the workmen has been hit below the belt. The contention is rejected.

15. For the foregoing reasons, my concluded Award is that the action of the management of Sitarampur Sub-Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited, P.O. Sitarampur, District Burdwan in terminating the services of the concerned workmen (except Sovan and Narayan Chandra Chowdhury, with whom we are not now concerned), mentioned in the Schedule to the Reference with effect from 1 January, 1976 is fully justified. It follows that the four workmen with whom we are now concerned in this reference are not entitled to any relief.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 20th June, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer
[No. I-19012(45)/76-D.III(B)/D.IV(B)]

S.O. 3031.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management

of G.M. Office of Salanpur Area of Eastern Coalfields Limited, post Office Salanpur, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1983.

THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-
LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 86/80

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of G.M.
Office of Salanpur Area of Eastern Coalfields Ltd.,
Post Office Salanpur, District Burdwan,

AND

Their Workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. N. Lala, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri J. D. Lal, Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Coal

STATE : West Bengal

Dated, the 1st July, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) referred the dispute to the Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta for adjudication. Subsequently by Order No. S-11025(4)/80-D.IV(B) dated 14th/17th November, 1980 the dispute has been transferred to this Tribunal for adjudication.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of the Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Salanpur, Distt. Burdwan in not granting the status of Head Clerk to Shri R. M. Patel, erstwhile Head Clerk of Chetkam Colliery and the status of Cashier Grade I to Shri N. K. Tekriwal, erstwhile Cashier of Phulberia Colliery, when they were absorbed in the General Manager's office of Salanpur Area after nationalisation was justified? If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled?"

2. The case of the workmen is that they were employed in the mines prior to take over and their service conditions were protected U/S 14(1) of the Coal Mines Nationalisation Act. There are two workmen in this case viz. Shri R. N. Patel and Shri N. K. Tekriwal. Shri R. N. Patel was posted at Chetkam Colliery while Sri Tekriwal was posted at Phulberia Colliery and both these collieries were situated in the District of Santhal Pargana, Bihar within Mugma Area.

3. The case of Shri R. N. Patel is that he was Head Clerk of Chetkam Colliery and was in special grade of the Wage Board and was designated as Head Clerk drawing a basic salary of Rs. 354 excluding D.A. etc. and the same payment was made to him upto April, 1974. This colliery, however, admittedly was not taken over as per the Coal Mines (Taking Over of Management) Act, 1973 which came into effect from 31-1-1973 but it was taken over on 31-5-1974.

4. It is submitted that the management without following any procedure under the Industrial Disputes Act curtailed the wages of Sri Patel with effect from May, 1974 and paid him a consolidated salary of Rs. 300 per month upto July, 1974 and in August '74 he was categorised and was put in Grade II and his pay was fixed at Rs. 233 per month with designation of Clerk only. It is further submitted that he was the Head Clerk and was getting basic salary of Rs. 354 per month but his pay was not protected. From Chetkam colliery the concerned workman was transferred to Dumka Sub-Area at Deoghar and from there he was transferred to Salanpur G. M. Office where he was put in Grade II. Besides above it is also claimed that he was also getting a messine allowance of Rs. 100 per month but it was also stopped.

His prayer is that his old designation of Head Clerk and status should be restored from 1-5-1974 and he should be put in special grade and be given the difference of wages for the period.

5. The case of Sri N. K. Tekriwal is that he was Cashier of Phulberia Colliery and his basic was Rs. 245 per month and he was in Grade I of the Wage Board. After take over he was posted at Dumka Sub-Area and from there he was transferred to Salanpur. It is alleged that the management wrongfully and without following the procedure under the Industrial Disputes Act changed his designation from Cashier to Clerk and he was put in Grade II on a basic salary of Rs. 205 per month from 1-6-1974. He also claims to be getting messing allowance of Rs. 100 per month. His prayer is that his basic pay should be Rs. 245 per month with effect from 1-6-1974 with the designation of Cashier in Grade I of the Wage Board and he should get his wages and messing allowance accordingly.

6. The defence of the management is that the sponsoring union viz. Coal Mines Union has got no locus-standi to raise the present dispute. According to them both these Clerks were originally posted under Mugma Area in the State of Bihar and so the competent authority to deal with the dispute was the A.L.C. Patna and not the A.L.C. Asansol and further this union was not functioning at all in Santhal Pargana District and it also does not function at Salanpur. The further case of the management is that under the take over of the mines by the Central Govt. which came into force from 31-1-1973 several collieries were taken over by the Govt. but these collieries which were very small collieries were not taken over on 31-1-73 but they were taken over in May, 1975 after the Coal Mines Nationalisation Act came into force on 31-5-1973.

7. It is submitted that since the Govt. of India never declared that it would not take over the coal mines which have been described in the schedule of the Taking Over of the Management Act but it was obvious that sooner or later all the collieries will also be taken over, hence mass scale manipulation of records started giving fictitious designations and salaries to the so called employees and large number of persons were also entered in the statutory registers. With the result that Chatkam and Phulberia Collieries were also not an exception and these two concerned workmen fabricated and manipulated the records of the two collieries to suit their convenience. Regarding Shri Patel it is stated that in the statutory register he has been variously described as Mine Incharge Record Keeper, Establishment Clerk till November '72 and his basic salary was shown at Rs. 185 only. In December '72 he was shown as Establishment Clerk-cum-Record Keeper on the same basic salary. The said basic salary is admissible to employees of Grade III but surprisingly in January '73 his designation was shown to have been changed as Head Clerk/Record Keeper on a basic salary of Rs. 305. It is submitted that this was done purposely after the Ordinance of Taking Over of Coal Mines was issued by the Govt. in January '73 and all these manipulations were made so that he may claim higher grade and pay from the management after nationalisation. It is also stated that the records further reveal that in between March '73 to September '73 he was mostly absent and his attendance varied from 2 to 5 days which obvious mean that he was not in employment. In January, 1974 his basic salary is shown as Rs. 354 which is not in accordance with the Wage Board scale. All the registers were thus forged and as no reliance could be placed on these documents, Sri Patel was placed in Grade II in the scale of Rs. 205 per month according to his attainments. The claim of Rs. 100 as messing allowance has also been denied and it is stated that this fact was not supported even by the manipulated documents of the erstwhile management. It is also submitted that as difficulties were being experienced by the Custodian on taking over these small mines, it was decided to give them consolidated salary of Rs. 300 per month upto July, 1974 and thereafter the fixation of the concerned workman was made in clerical Grade II and his pay was fixed at Rs. 233 per month. According to the management the concerned workman accepted the said scale and never agitated the matter till 1978 which also means that he has got no case.

8. Regarding Shri N. K. Tekriwal it is stated that from the information available it was found that he was a partner in the said colliery owned by Shri M. P. Marwari and that he was working periodically from time to time from the year 1970. During the relevant period he worked from 6-11-1972 to 31-3-1973 and thereafter from 1-7-73 and as he was a partner in the colliery he was not taken over by the Govt. He, however, sent several representations and eventually he was absorbed as Grade II Clerk on a starting basic salary of Rs. 205 per month from November, 1974. It is submitted that this was altogether a new employment and so his other claim is not tenable and is also not supported by the documents.

9. On the above grounds it is prayed that the Reference be decided in favour of the management.

10. The point for consideration is as to whether the action of the management in not granting the status of Head Clerk to Shri Patel and the status of Cashier Grade I to Shri Tekriwal when they were absorbed in the General Manager's Office at Salanpur Area after nationalisation is justified. If not, to what relief are the concerned workmen entitled.

11. At the outset it may be stated that Sri N. K. Tekriwal did not come to the witness box to depose in support of his case and his case was not pressed during the course of argument by the union. It is the definite case of the management that Shri Tekriwal was a partner of Phulberia colliery and he worked there off and on only and as he was not an employee of the said colliery nor on the rolls of the said colliery on the date of take over hence he was not absorbed and he was absorbed subsequently. The fact that he was a partner of this colliery has not been denied by him. MW-1 Sri J. P. Singh is at present an Agent of Jambad Colliery under the management. He had been appointed as Customs to take over mines located in Santhal Pargana in 1974 and he has stated that he took over Phulberia Colliery on 30-5-74. According to him this was very small colliery as will appear from man-power list Ext. M-1 which shows that total number of employees in this colliery was only 51. He has further stated that Tekriwal was reported to be the son of the owner and also partner of the colliery and so he was not taken over on the date of take over of this mine. Thereafter on his representation his case was considered by the Screening Committee thoroughly and he was given fresh appointment from November, 1974 as Clerk Grade II. It is further stated by him that this colliery on the date of take over had production of 10 tonnes per day and was a seasonal mine. He has also filed Form 'B' register of this colliery which has been marked Ext. M-2. From the entries made in this register it will appear that the name of Shri Tekriwal appears at Sl. No. 4 and his date of appointment is 1-11-70 and date of termination is 15-6-71. It bears his signature. Again his name appears in Sl. No. 77 designated as Cashier. Date of appointment is 6-1-72 and date of termination is 31-3-72. It also bears the signature of Sri Tekriwal. Again his name appears in S. No. 171 showing his date of appointment as 1-7-73 but no designation is mentioned. Ext. M-3 is the establishment register of Phulberia colliery and his pay as mentioned in it differs in different month. There was no paper to show that Sri Tekriwal was member of Coal Mines Provident Fund. This colliery was closed shortly thereafter and Tekriwal after his appointment was posted at Deoghar Sub-Area office which was subsequently attached to Salanpur area where his pay was fixed as stated above.

12. Thus from all these documents and the evidence of MW-1 it is clear that Sri Tekriwal was a fresh employee appointed in Clerk Grade II and the registers show manipulations and on those registers the claim of Shri Tekriwal cannot be sustained. The union has also rightly not pressed this case at the time of argument.

13. Then let us examine the case of Shri Patel. His case is that at Chatkam colliery he was working as Head Clerk in special grade and he should get the same scale and grade by the present management. This colliery was also taken over by the Govt. on 31-5-74 and MW-1 was appointed as Custodian of this colliery. It was also small colliery having man-power of 98 only vide Ext. M-1 prepared by MW-1.

14. Let us now examine the relevant registers of Chatkam colliery and see whether the claim of Sri Patel is sustainable. Ext. M-5 is the pay register of Chatkam colliery. It is admitted by WW-1 Sri Patel in his evidence that entries made in this register are correct. This register would show that in January '72 he was designated as Mining Incharge having a basic salary of Rs. 185 only. It does not show that he was getting any messing allowance as claimed by him. The same designation and basic pay continued till April '72. In May '72 he has been designated as Attendance Clerk and Mining Incharge having the same basic salary of Rs. 185. This is in Sl. No. 7 and it would show that the word 'M. Incharge' has been subsequently written on it in different pen. In July '72 he has been designated as Record Keeper having the same basic salary of Rs. 185. This continues till November '72. In December '72 he has been shown as Establishment Clerk/Record Keeper drawing the same Rs. 185 as his basic salary. In January, 1974 his designation is changed altogether and he has been shown as Head Clerk-cum-Record Keeper. This is on Sl. No. 6 and from a very look on it it will appear that some erasing has been made and the word 'Head Clerk' has been written subsequently. The basic salary has been shown at Rs. 405. There is a clear manipulation in this register. The same salary continues till December '73 and in January, 1974 his basic salary has been shown as Rs. 305 which is not in the scale of Wage Board. It is surprising that till December '72 he was getting a basic salary of Rs. 185 only but in the following month i.e. in January '73 his basic salary was shown at Rs. 305. This was evidently because the non-coking coal mines were taken over by the Govt. from January '73 and the employees knew that they will also come under the Central Govt. and hence this manipulation was made to claim higher scale and pay from the Govt. WW-1 is Shri Patel himself. It is admitted by him in his chief that till December '72 he was in Grade III and just thereafter he got his special grade in January '73. It is also admitted by him that among the Clerks first they are Grade III, then Grade II and then Grade I and last Special Grade. This workman all on a sudden got tripple promotion from Grade III to Special Grade without any rhyme and reason and in para 11 he has stated that he got promotion from Grade III to Special Grade verbally. This contention of the workman cannot be believed by any stretch of imagination and it is clear that this register was manufactured and manipulated after the mines were taken over by the Govt.

15. Then let us examine the Form B register Ext. M-6 of this colliery. The name of the concerned workman appear in Sl. No. 6 and in column 5 where the nature of employment is mentioned, something written earlier has been erased and the word 'Head Clerk with duty R. Keeper' has been mentioned in different ink and pen. Thus manipulation was made in Form B register also. It is thus apparent that the very basis of the claim of the concerned workman is based on the manufactured and manipulated document which was done subsequently and his claim cannot be said to be sustainable. MW-1 who took over this colliery as Custodian has stated that Sri Patel was working as a Cashier at the time he went to take over this colliery and the Cashier of that colliery could be given Grade II as it was a very small colliery and therefore in the beginning he paid a consolidated salary of Rs. 300 per month when his pay was fixed at Rs. 284 in Grade II in August '74. He has also stated that Sri Patel never worked as a Head Clerk and that he never made any representation regarding his fitment till the year 1978 or 1979. It is thus clear from the documents discussed above that a false claim has been made by Sri Patel in the present Reference. He was working as Clerk Grade III and in that circumstances the management was perfectly justified in fixing him in Grade II. At present he is in Grade I.

16. It will also appear that though the fixation was made in the year 1974 but no claim was ever made by any of these workmen before the management. It is for the first time that Sri Patel made representation before the Sub-Area Manager by his representation Ext. W-3 dated 6-8-77. The dispute for the first time however was raised by the union by letter Ext. W-7 dated 22nd/29th May '78 written by the General Secretary of the sponsoring union to the General Manager, Salanpur Area and thereafter dispute was raised before the A.L.C. The union has filed the membership register as also counter-foils (Exts. W-10, W-11 & W-11/1) to show that the union function in Salanpur Area. WW-2 has also come to state about it. The question, however, is even

if the union function in the area is there any resolution of the Executive Committee of the union to sponsor this dispute. It cannot be denied that unless there is such a resolution by the Executive Committee of the union no such dispute can be sponsored by any union. The union raised this dispute vide Ext. W-7 dated 22nd/29th May '78. The union ought to have filed the resolution showing that prior to this date such a resolution was passed, but no such resolution has been filed nor any explanation has been given for non-filing of the same. Instead the union has filed copy of minutes of the discussion dated 18-3-78 (Ext. W-9) which only shows that the case was referred to the Tribunal but this is not a resolution authorising the union to raise the dispute. The union has also filed Ext. W-8 which is a representation dated 17-5-78 filed by 333 workmen requesting the union to take up this case. But this is not sufficient. In the absence of any resolution of the Executive Committee to raise the dispute, the present dispute as sponsored by the union is not legal and valid in law and the Reference suffers on this score also.

17. The union has also filed certain documents Exts. W-1 to W-4 but they are not at all relevant in view of the documents and evidence discussed above nor they were referred to at the time of argument.

18. Considering these, I hold that the action of the management in not granting the status of Head Clerk to Shri Patel and the status of Cashier to Shri Tekriwal when they were absorbed in the General Manager's Office at Salanpur is justified and legal and in the circumstances the workmen are not entitled to any relief.

19. The award is given accordingly.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-19012(1)/79-D.IV(B)]

S.O. 3032.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 3, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of New Satgram Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Devchandnagar, District Burdwan and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 5th July, 1983

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT NO. 3, DHANBAD

Reference No. 50/82

PRESENT:

Shri J. N. Singh, Presiding Officer.

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of New Satgram Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Devchandnagar, Dist. Burdwan.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

For the Employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri Samar Bose.

INDUSTRY : Coal

STATE : West Bengal

Dated, the 1st July, 1983

AWARD

The Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour in exercise of the powers conferred on them U/S 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 14 of 1947 has referred the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication under Order No. L-19012 (30)/82-D.IV(B) dated the 28th May, 1982.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of S/Shri P. C. Chattaraj and Deven Das of New Satgram Colliery, P.O. Devchandnagar, Dist. Burdwan of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd. for payment of difference of wages between grade-II and grade-III for the period from 24-3-75 and 12-5-75 respectively to 1-12-77 the dates of their regularisation as Bonus/PF Clerk, is justified? If so, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

2. On 28-6-1983 both the parties have filed joint petition of compromise duly signed by both the parties with a prayer to pass an award in terms of the settlement.

3. I have gone through the terms of the settlement and it is beneficial for the workmen.

4. In the circumstances the award is passed in terms of the settlement which shall form part of the award.

J. N. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

Dated.—1-7-83

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 3, DHANBAD

In the matter of Ref. No. 50 of 1982

PARTIES

Employers in relation to the Management of New Satgram Colliery of M/s. Eastern Coalfields Ltd., P.O. Devchandnagar, Dist. Burdwan.

AND

Their Workmen.

JOINT PETITION OF EMPLOYERS AND WORKMEN

The above mentioned employers as well as the workmen most respectfully beg to submit jointly as follows:—

(1) That, the employers as well as the workmen have mutually negotiated the matter and have come to an overall amicable settlement of the same on the following terms and conditions:—

(a) That the Management shall pay to Shri P.C. Chattaraj, Clerk Gr. II, 50 per cent of the difference of wages between what he had received as Clerk Gr. III from 24-3-75 to 30-11-77 and the wages as admissible on the minimum of the NCWA-I pay scale of Clerk Gr. II, i.e. Rs. 378 P.M.

(b) That the Management shall pay to Shri Deven Das Clerk Gr. II, 50 per cent of the difference of wages between what he had received as Clerk Gr. III from 12-5-75 to 30-4-77 and the wages as admissible on the minimum of the NCWA-I pay scale of Clerk Grade II, i.e. Rs. 378 p.m.

(c) That S/Shri P. C. Chattaraj and Deven Das shall receive from the Management, the payment as indicated in sub-para (a) and (b) above respectively in full and final settlement of their claims in this reference.

(d) That in regard to seniority of S/shri P. C. Chattaraj and Deven Das, in the post of Clerk Grade-II, this will be reckoned only from 1-12-77.

(2) That the employers as well as the workmen agree that this is an overall settlement of the claims of the workmen arising out of this reference and it is in full and final settlement of the same.

(3) That the employers as well as the workmen consider that the above agreement is fair and just to both the parties.

In view of the above, the employers as well as the workmen jointly pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept this joint petition and give an award in terms thereof.

SAMAR BOSE

Executive Member,
Colliery Mazdoor Sacha of
India,

P.O. Devchandnagar

Distt. Burdwa

FOR & ON BEHALF OF
WORKMEN

Witness.

1. Deben Das

2. P. Chatley

AGENT

Satgram (R) Colliery,
Eastern Coalfields Limited,

P.O. Devchandnagar,

Distt. Burdwa

FOR & ON BEHALF
EMPLOYERS.

Advocate

for Employers.

[No. L-19012(30)/82-D.IV(B)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer.

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1983

S.O. 3033.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court No. 1, Bombay in the Industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Area Manager in Sub-Area No. 1, of W.V.A. of Western Coalfields Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1 AT BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-6 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Sub-Area Manager in Sub-Area No. 1 of W.V.A. of M/s. Western Coalfields Limited.

AND

Their Workman

APPEARANCES :

For the employer.—Mr. P. Sadasivam Nair, Advocate.

For Wardha Valley Colliery Workers' Union.

—No Appearance.

INDUSTRY : Coal & Mines STATE : Maharashtra

Bombay, the 29th day of June, 1983

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by order No. L-18012(4)/82-D.IV(B) dated 13th August, 1982, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Sub-Area Manager in Sub-Area No. 1 of W.V.A. of M/s. Western Coalfields Limited and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the schedule mentioned below:—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Sub-Area Manager in Sub Area No. 1 of W.V.A., W.C. Ltd., P.O- Shivaji nagar, Distt. Chandrapur is justified in dismissing Shri Chandrapal Vasudeo, H.T.T. under letter No. WCL/RC/MGR/Par 1921-25/81, dated 18-6-1982? If not, to what relief he is entitled?"

2. The workman, Chandrapal Vasudeo, was initially appointed at Ballarpur Colliery, Dist. Chandrapur since about 1968. He applied for transfer to Rajur Colliery and he

was transferred to that Colliery in October, 1978. According to the workman he was working as Haulage Engine Khalasi in Ballarpur Colliery and he was transferred to Rajur Colliery to work in the same capacity. He worked at Rajur as Haulage Engine Khalasi up to 30-9-1980. However, on 31-8-1980 he was told by the Manager of the Colliery that he will not be allowed to work as Haulage Khalasi. The Union stated in the statement of claim that the workman then applied to the Manager, Ballarpur Colliery that he should be sent back to Ballarpur Colliery. The Manager, Rajur Colliery, however, wrote on that application that the workman should work as Trammer Loader and that the workman will not be employed as Haulage Khalasi. It is stated in the statement of claim that thereafter the workman was not allowed to work from 31-8-1980. On 25-9-1980 the Manager of Rajur Colliery handed over a letter to the workman to carry the same to the Manager, Ballarpur Colliery. Some information was sought in that letter about the status of the workman. After the workman returned from Ballarpur Colliery he was not allowed to work. On 6-12-1980 the workman gave a notice to the management that he would go on fast and upto death if he was not taken back for work within 10 days. The workman had informed in that notice that he would sit for fast in front of the office of the Rajur Colliery from 20-12-1980. The workman was, thereafter, charge-sheeted by charge-sheet dated 10/11-12-1980 on the charge that he was absent from duty without leave. The workman ended his fast on 29-12-1980 on the intervention of the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C). When the workman was sitting for fast he had sent a reply to the charge-sheet. It is stated in the statement of claim that the inquiry conducted by the management was an eye wash. One Jahagirdar was appointed as the inquiry-officer who was the servant of the management and who had represented the management before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner. It is stated in the statement of claim that the order of dismissal passed against the workman is illegal and against the principles of natural justice. It was, therefore, prayed that the order of dismissal be set aside and the workman be reinstated with all consequential benefits.

3. The management filed the written statement on 19-10-1982 and pleaded as follows. The workman was initially working in Ballarpur Colliery and he was designated there as Haulage Time-rated Trammer (for short "HTT"). He applied for transfer. Due to a typographical mistake in the transfer order he was shown as Haulage Khalasi (for short "HK") and on the basis of that order he was permitted to work as Haulage Khalasi. HTT and HK are both in category III of the Wage Board and their wages are one and the same. Subsequently, when the last pay certificate and service particulars of the workman were received from Ballarpur Colliery it was seen that he was working as HTT. A reference was, therefore, made by the Manager, Rajur colliery to the Manager, Ballarpur Colliery regarding the correct designation of the workman. The latter informed that the designation of the workman was HTT as per their record. HTT's are also permitted to work as HK on account of administrative necessity. This, however, does not confer any right on the workman for the job of 'HK' unless specifically appointed and designated as such. The workman was allowed to work for sometime as HK in Rajur Colliery due to mistake. When this mistake came to notice he was asked to work as a Trammer. He, however, refused to do that work from 1-9-1980. He was given a memo on 17-9-1980. He did not submit any reply to the same. He, however, reported for duty for one day on 29-9-1980 and was permitted to work on that day. Thereafter, again he remained absent without any justification. His attitude was totally unreasonable. He indulged in threats, abuses and illegal strike not expected of an employee in Public Sector Undertaking. He was, therefore, given a charge-sheet on 10/11-12-1980 for remaining absent without leave or permission from 1-9-1980. One Qureshi was appointed as the inquiry officer. The workman, however, did not participate in the inquiry. The inquiry officer, therefore, had no any other but to proceed with the inquiry ex-parte. The management produced the evidence in the course of the inquiry. The inquiry officer found that the workman was absent without leave and without permission. He gave

his finding accordingly. The finding of the inquiry officer was submitted to the Manager. He agreed with that finding. The Manager after obtaining necessary approval by the Sub-Area Manager passed on order dated 18-6-1981 dismissing the workman. The management maintained that the inquiry was conducted in a proper and fair manner and that in view of the past record of the workman the order of dismissal was justified. It was, therefore, submitted that the workman was not entitled to any relief.

4. I had framed a preliminary issue whether the domestic inquiry conducted against the workman was fair, proper and in accordance with the principles of natural justice. I held in my order dated 2-6-1983 that the inquiry was fair and it was properly conducted and that it did not suffer from any infirmity. Now, the question is whether the charge framed against the workman is proved. The charge against him was that he was absent from duty without leave or permission from 1-9-1980. The chargesheet is dated 10/11-12-1980. The workman was asked to submit his written explanation within three days of the receipt of the letter communicating to him the charge framed against him. In his reply dated 18-12-1980 (exhibit M-7) he has not given any reasonable explanation for his absence. He has not stated there that he was absent with leave or permission. He has vaguely stated that the charge is false. He did not participate in the inquiry even though the notices of the dates of hearing were issued to him and that he received the same. Documentary evidence was produced by the management which is referred to in the order of the inquiry officer to prove that the workman was not granted any leave and no any application was submitted by him for the same during the period of his absence. The inquiry officer, therefore, held that the workman was absent from duty from 1-9-1980 to 11-12-1980 without leave or permission and that this constituted a misconduct as per Standing Orders 17(1)(n) applicable to Rajur Colliery. This finding of the inquiry officer was accepted by the Manager, Rajur Colliery, who is a disciplinary authority.

5. It may be mentioned that I had the occasion to decide an industrial dispute raised by the General Secretary, Wardha Valley Colliery Workers' Union on behalf of this very workman, on a reference made by the Central Government. That reference was numbered as CGIT-24 of 1981. The question for consideration there was —

"Whether the action of the management of Rajur Colliery of WCL, PO, Rajur, Distt. Chandrapur in changing the designation of Shri Chandrapal Vasudeo from Haulage Khalasi to Haulage Trammer and subsequently stopping him from work with effect from 1-9-1980 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?"

The contention of the workman in that reference was that he was stopped from work with effect from 1-9-1980. A copy of my award in that reference is placed on record by the management. There was a dispute in that reference whether the workman was 'HTT' or whether he was 'HK'. The workman claimed that he was HK and not HTT. In that award I have held that the workman was HTT. On the question whether the management had stopped him from work. I held that the management did not stop him from work.

6. It will thus be seen that the workman did not appear in the inquiry proceedings started against him by the management and in the previous reference which involved more or less the same point it was held that the management had not stopped him from work and that it was the workman who stopped doing work as he was told to the work of Haulage Trammer to which category he belonged.

7. Having regard to all these material I hold that the charges framed against the workman about his continued absence from work is proved. The next question is about the punishment. The order of dismissal is passed against him by the Manager, Rajur Colliery. In that order there is

no reference to any past bad record of the workman. However, some averments are made about his alleged past record in the written statement filed on behalf of the management. Those averments are not contravened by the workman. I, therefore, hold that the order of dismissal passed against the workman is justified.

8. It appears that the workman was allowed to work as HK for a long time, may be for the convenience of the establishment. He was allowed to work as HK both at Ballarpur Colliery and at Rajur Colliery. The workman, therefore, believed that he had a right to work as HK only and not as HTT. He, therefore, refused to do that work and he remained absent. Under these circumstances, if after the publication of this award the workman offers himself for work and shows his willingness to do the work as HTT the management should consider whether it could give him that job with or without continuity of service—of course having regard to the rules and standing orders governing the establishment. None is present on behalf of the Union before me since April, 1983. If there would have been appearance on behalf of the Union before passing the final orders in this reference I would have made a effort to see if some reasonable settlement was possible.

9. On the materials before me, however, I hold that the management was justified in dismissing the workman, Chandranal Vasudeo, from service under letter dated 18-6-1981.

10. My award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. D. KAMBLI, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-18012(4)/82-D.IV(B)]

S. S. PRASHER, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1983

S.O. 3034.—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Coal India Limited 10, Netaji Subash Road, Calcutta-I and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 8th July, 1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 39 of 1979

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Coal India Limited, Calcutta-1:

AND

Their Workman

PRESENT:

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the Employers—Mr. P. S. Manoharan, Addl. Chief Legal Manager, with Mr. R. K. Sinha Roy, Personnel Manager.

On behalf of the workman—Mr. K. L. Pandey, concerned workman Personally appear.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal India

AWARD

The following dispute was sent to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour by their Order No. L-19012(5)/78-D.IV(B) dated 13th June, 1979 ;

"Whether the action of the management of Messrs Coal India Limited, 10, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-700001 in not absorbing Shri Kishorilal Pandey, Cash Clerk in the services of the new Company with effect from the date of nationalisation of Messrs Jhagrakhand Colliery Private Limited in May, 1973 is justified. If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

2. Kishorilal Pandey the concerned workman was an employee of the old Company M/s. Jhagrakhand Colliery Private Limited, whose head office was at 15, Gariahat Road, Calcutta-19. This Colliery was taken over by the Govt. of India and their management vested in Coal Mines Authority, whose successor-in-interest is Coal India Limited.

3. A preliminary objection has been raised by the management of Coal India Limited that there is no Industrial Dispute within the meaning of Section 2(k) or 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, to be decided by the Tribunal and so the reference is incompetent. In my opinion this contention is valid. Admittedly the dispute in question has not been sponsored by any union or by a group of workmen. Kishorilal Pandey himself raised the dispute presumably u/s. 2A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, that section runs as below:

".....2A. Dismissal, etc., of an individual workman to be deemed to be an industrial dispute—Where any employer discharges, dismisses, retrenches or otherwise terminates the services of an individual workman, any dispute or difference between that workman and his employer connected with, or arising out of, such discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination shall be deemed to be an industrial dispute notwithstanding that no other workman nor any union of workmen is a party to the dispute."

On a perusal of the above it is clear that the section relates only to cases of discharge, dismissal, retrenchment or termination of service otherwise and not to non-absorption in service.

4. In the present case the dispute is about not absorbing Kishorilal Pandey in the service of Coal India Limited. It is clear that such a dispute is not covered by Section 2A aforesaid the dispute therefore cannot be called as an industrial dispute.

5. In the above circumstances I hold that the instant dispute is not an industrial dispute either within the meaning of Sec. 2(k) or Sec. 2(A) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The reference is thus held to be incompetent.

This is my award.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

Dated, Calcutta,
The 1st July, 1983.

S. S. PRASHER, Desk Officer.

[No. L-19012(5)/78-D.IV(B)]

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1983

S.O. 3025.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. II, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Shri Jose N. D'Souza, Owner of Launch ML Vailankini, Goa and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT:

Shri M. A. Deshpande, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-2/8 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Shri Jose N. D.'Souza, Owner
of Launch 'ML Vailankini'.

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employer—Shri S. N. N. Karmali, Advocate.

For the workmen—1. Shri A. D. Costa, Advocate, 2.
Shri S. V. Rao, Goa Labour Union.

INDUSTRY : Port and Docks.

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu

Bombay, the 30th June, 1983

AWARD

By their order No. L-36011(17)/82-D.IV(A) dated 17-2-1983, the Central Government referred the following dispute for adjudication under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

"Whether the action of Shri Jose N. D.' Souza, Owner of Launch 'ML Vailankini' in stopping S/Shri Vasu Harvalekar, Joao I. Fernandes, Chandrakant Harvalekar and Ashok K. Kadam from work with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief the said workmen are entitled?"

2. Despite notices to the parties neither the Union nor the management filed statement of claim or written statement, and the reason behind the same as stated by Shri S. V. Rao, who is representing the workman is that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties whereby the four workmen in question are reported to have accepted all their dues in full and total satisfaction of their claim. In view of this settlement and in view of the settlement though out of court, the dispute cannot survive. Hence the dispute is disposed of.

Award accordingly. No order as to costs

M. A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer.
[No. L-36011/17/82-D.IV(A)]
R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer.

S.O. 3036.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 1, Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to M/s. Killick Nixon Ltd., Mormugao (Goa) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 6th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 1 AT BOMBAY

PRESENT :

Justice M. D. Kambli Esqr.—Presiding Officer.

Reference No. CGIT-16 of 1978

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs
Killick Nixon Limited, Mormugao (Goa)

APPEARANCES :

For the employer—Mr. C. J. John, Advocate.

For Goa Dock Labour Union—Mr. K. P. V. Menon,
Advocate.

INDUSTRY : Port and Docks

STATE : Goa, Daman
and Diu

Bombay, the 25th day of June, 1983

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by order No. L-36012(2)/78-D.IV(A) dated 24th May, 1978, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) have referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Messrs Killick Nixon Limited, Mormugao (Goa) and their workman in respect of the matters specified in the schedule mentioned below :—

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Messrs Killick Nixon Limited, Mormugao Harbour (Goa), are justified in not implementing the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers and the Wage Revision Committee, as amended by the Settlement dated the 14th July, 1977 in respect of Shri Prabhakar R. Bandekar, Peon, working at Mormugao Harbour Office? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. M/s. Killick Nixon Limited (hereinafter referred to as the "company") filed its written statement on 13-7-1978. It pleaded as follows. The reference is extremely vague as there is no particular demand specifically referred to this Tribunal for adjudication. The company has only a shipping department and the main business of the company is, inter alia, as manufacturers, dealers, agents and general merchants. The recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Worker and of Wage Board Revision Committee as modified by the settlement dated 14-7-1974 are not binding on the company. Even if the recommendations are binding on the company the company is not statutorily bound to implement them. The workman, Bandekar, was appointed only as a peon in the Goa office of the company. He is not and never was a port and dock worker. As far as Goa office is concerned the shipping work in the docks is almost nil. In fact, the company catered to the shipping work of just one ship during the last three years in 1975, 1976 and 1977 and that work was not done in Mormugao, but in Mangalore. It cannot, therefore, be said that the workman was a port and dock worker. He is governed by the terms and conditions of service as per his appointment letter and for any betterment of his conditions of service an industrial dispute has to be raised in specific terms of wage revision and not in general terms as set out in the order of reference. On these pleas the company submitted that the demand of the Union was not tenable.

3. The Goa Dock Labour Union (hereinafter referred to as the "Union") filed the statement of claim on behalf of the workman on 22-11-1979, though it is dated 23-6-1979. The Union submitted that the company is carrying on the business of shipping agency at Mormugao harbour. The company is having its head office at Bombay. The members of the staff employed by the company in its shipping agency department and who are connected with the company's work in the docks or in the port at Bombay have been given the benefits of the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers. The Union submitted that though the workman work as a peon in the office of the company situated at Mormugao harbour and although he is a port and dock worker he was not been given any benefit of the recommendations of the said Wage Board. According to the Union the workman for the purposes of his work, is required to visit the docks and the ships for the purposes of carrying out the duties assigned to him. In fact, his main work is within the area of Mormugao harbour and

is connected with the movement of Ships in the port. The Union further stated that the peons with other shipping agencies like Chowgule, Dempo Salgaonkar etc. are given the benefits of the Wage Board's recommendations as well as of the Wage Revision Committee as modified by the settlement dated 14-7-1977. The Union, therefore, claimed that the company should implement the said recommendations in respect of the workman, Bandekar, also. The Union submitted that Bandekar is a port and dock worker and is eligible to receive the benefits of the Wage Board's recommendations and also of the Wage Revision Committee. The Union, therefore, prayed that this Tribunal be pleased to direct the company to extend the said benefits to the workman.

4. The parties relied on oral and documentary evidence. The Union examined workman Bandekar. The Union examined O. A. Alikate, who is the Secretary of the Goa Dock Labour Board, as UW-2. He is examined to prove the scale of pay of a peon covered by the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers. His evidence is not material to find out whether the present workman is a dock worker. The Union also examined Captain, K. S. Varadkar as UW-3, who was serving with the company for some time from April or May 1973 towards September, 1975. He was examined to show that upturning vessel Gosalia Prospects was managed by the company under a contract from 1973 for a period of about two years. The company examined one of their officers by name D. S. Kumana as EW-1. He is the senior executive incharge of shipping, clearing and forwarding department since 1968.

5. The first contention raised on behalf of the company is that Bandekar was the only workman in the office of the company at Goa. There were no other workmen to sponsor his cause. A single workman by merely joining a Union cannot authorise the Union to raise a dispute regarding the terms of employment. There was, therefore, no industrial dispute and consequently the reference is bad. If that contention is upheld a single workman will never be able to have his grievances redressed. The Supreme Court has held in the case of Central Provinces Transport Services Ltd. v. R. G. Patwardhan (1957 1 L.L.J. 27) that though a dispute between the employer and a single employee cannot per se be an "industrial dispute" within the meaning of Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, it might become one if it is taken up by the union or a number of workmen. In this case it is not disputed that the workman is a member of the Union. This dispute is taken up by that Union. It will, therefore, be an industrial dispute.

6. The important question to be decided in this reference is whether Bandekar is a "dock worker" as defined in the Dock Workers' (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948. The terms "dock worker" has been defined in the said Act as under :—

"Dock worker" means a person employed or to be employed in, or in the vicinity of, any port on work in connection with the loading, unloading, movement or storage of cargoes or work in connection with the preparation of ships or other vessels for the receipt or discharge of cargoes or leaving port."

7. Before we proceed to consider the question whether the workman Bandekar fits in this definition it is necessary to see what work the company was doing at Marmugao and what work this workman was doing in the company. For this purpose, we shall have to turn to the oral evidence on record. It may be mentioned that Bandekar was employed in the company since November, 1963. According to the company, shipping work of the company in the docks is almost nil. In its written statement the company contended that the company carried on the shipping work of just one ship each during the last three years in 1975, 1976 and 1977 and that work too was not done in Marmugao but in Mangalore. The workman stated in his cross-examination that about seven ships came after he joined the company. He stated that between 1963 and 1975 two ships of the company's goods had come. A suggestion was made to him that it is in 1975 only that the first ship came after he 462GI/83—8

joined the company. The workman denied that suggestion. He further denied the suggestion that only one ship came in 1976 and one ship came in 1977. He admitted that the company has no godown at Marmugao. The Union's witness Varadkar is now serving with M/s. V. N. Salgaonkar and Bros. Pvt. Ltd. Prior to his employment he was working with the company as a port captain. He stated that he was appointed in the company in the month of April or May, 1973. He left the company towards the end of 1975. He stated that the company was working as steam ships agents and agents for foreign principals thus corroborating what the company's witness Dorab Kumana deposed. He stated in clear terms that from 1973 i.e. from the time he joined the company till he left the company in 1975 no goods were cleared by Killick Nixon from the ships by the Goa office. He left the company sometime by September 1975. Witness Varadkar stated that the company does the work of clearing agent at Bombay and that there was no clearing work of goods for the company at Goa. In his cross-examination he stated that Killick Nixon was not the importers of goods. He further stated that only a few ships of the foreign principals were sent to Goa port and the company had to look after those ships as steam ships agents. Agency work of the company he was categorical, does not consist of clearing of goods or loading or unloading of goods. According to him, it consisted of (i) looking after the customs office business, (ii) shipping office business, (iii) providing the captain of the ship money required by him and (iv) looking after the officers to book their passage, and despatch them to their own country, etc. In reply to the questions put by the Tribunal captain Varadkar stated that the work of loading and unloading which is called stevedoring was not done by the company. He stated that the company was not doing the work of reaching the goods to the jetty or taking the goods from the jetty to the warehouse.

8. The company's witness Dorab Kumana stated that the company acts as steamer agents and also as protecting agents. He stated that the company did not do shipping i.e. loading or unloading work at Goa. According to him, no stevedoring work was done at Goa by the company and that they have no warehouse or godown at Goa.

9. The Union has adduced evidence to show that the company was managing an upturning vessel Gosalia Prospects. Varadkar was examined in support of this contention. Varadkar stated that the company came in the management of the said vessel in 1973, and that the said vessel was with the company for two-and-a-half years. The Union wanted to show that while managing this upturning vessel the company did the work of loading and unloading ore. Varadkar stated that the said vessel lifted the iron ore on the barges coming from the mines and put it on board the ocean going carriers. Recruitment of labour and payment to the officers working on this vessel was, according to Varadkar, the responsibility of the company.

10. The company's witness Kumana also stated that Gosalia Prospects was managed by the company under a contract for sometime in 1971 to 1972. He however, stated that none of their employees were involved in the loading or unloading work. He stated that barges brought the ore from up river and took that ore to the said vessel. Loading the ore from the barges to the vessel Gosalia was done by mechanical process. Mechanics for loading the ore were employed by the company on behalf of the owner Shantilal and Co. Kumana wanted to state that these mechanics were paid by Shantilal and Co. He added that the company might have made payments on behalf of Shantilal and Co. According to him, the company's work consisted of seeing, by way of overall supervision, that the ore was properly loaded into the vessel. He admitted that the crew on this vessel was recruited by this company and not Shantilal and Co. The evidence adduced both by the Union and by the company would thus show that the company was not concerned with the work of loading and unloading the goods in the ships. Captain Varadkar examined for the Union as UW-2 was emphatic that from 1973 i.e. from the time he joined the company till he left the company in about September 1975 no goods were cleared by the company. He was emphatic that there was no clearing work of goods by the company at Goa. A suggestion was.

however, made to the workman Bandekar in his cross-examination on behalf of the company. It was suggested that only three ships had come of the company in the port for unloading the goods of the company, one in 1975, one in 1976 and one in 1977. It is not clear from this suggestion who did the work of actual unloading the goods whether the company itself or some other agency. The workman Bandekar was working with this company since 1963. It is the case of the company that they worked at Goa as steamer agents and protecting agents which work is not concerned with the loading or unloading of goods. The company's witness Kumana stated that they had no work of loading at Goa other than the work on Gosalia. The evidence thus shows that the company was not engaged in the work of loading or unloading the goods at Marmugao.

11. Now, the next question is whether it can be said that the company did the work of loading the goods into the ships or vessels while it was managing uptopping vessel Gosalia Prospects. The evidence of Kumana shows that barges brought the ore from up river and took that ore to the vessel. It does not appear that the company was connected with these barges. Loading the ore from barges to the vessel Gosalia was done by mechanical process. Mechanics were employed by the company. The evidence of captain Varadkar would show that these mechanics were also paid by the company. No any workman put the iron ore from the barges into Gosalia. It appears that by mechanical process carried on with the help of mechanics, iron ore was lifted from the barges coming from the mines and it was put on board the ocean going carriers. It is contended for the company that this work cannot be said to be the work of loading or unloading the goods with the help of some workers. It is very doubtful whether this work can be said to be the work of loading the cargoes into the ships. Assuming that this work amounted to loading of the cargoes into the ships according to the evidence of captain Varadkar this work was done only for two-and-a-half years from 1973. The workman Bandekar was employed in this company in the year 1963. The present dispute arose in the year 1977. It can, therefore, be said that assuming that the company did the work of loading the cargoes into the ship Gosalia that work was there only for a very limited period, long after this workman joined this company and that work was not there when the dispute arose.

12. Now, the next and important question is what work was done by the workman and whether the work done by him enables him to claim that he is a dock worker. Bandekar stated in his deposition that he works as a peon, but he added :—

"Whenever the ship comes in Marmugao the company ask me to hand over letters to the captain and I am required to bring back the letters and other articles, etc., given by the captain to the company. When there is no ship I am required to go to the post office and bring the tapals of the company from the post office. When there is no other work I have to remain as stand-by in the office."

In his cross-examination he stated :—

"I never did loading and unloading work of goods from the ship or to the ship. I did not do any other work in connection with the ship except bringing the letters, etc., from the ship or handing over the letters, etc., to the ship."

Varadkar stated that the workman did peon's job and he acted as messenger. He attended to the staff in the office. He was sent to the ship for delivering tapals. He was also going to the ship for making payments to the officers. In his cross-examination he stated that the main work of Bandekar was the work of a peon of the office. The company's witness Kumana stated that Bandekar was concerned with carrying messages and while in the office carrying papers from one table to other. He added that if Bandekar delivered certain documents to the vessels they must be of the crewmen, to be handed over to them. They were not concerned with loading or unloading of goods by the company. He added that from 1975 the employees in their office at Goa were Redkar and Bandekar. It is not suggested to this witness nor it is brought out from the evidence of captain Varadkar

that the company had employed many persons at Marmugao in connection with the work of loading or unloading the goods. Kumana admitted that if the occasion arose Bandekar used to go to the ship Gosalia for the delivery of the mail. The evidence thus shows that the company had no work of loading or unloading the cargo at Marmugao. Bandekar was not concerned with the work of loading or unloading. The company was acting as steamer agents and protecting agents at Goa. The office of the company at Marmugao was, therefore, not concerned with the work of loading or unloading the cargoes. Assuming that the work done by Gosalia Prospects was the work of loading the cargoes it was only for a very short period i.e. long after he joined this company and that work ceased to be done about a couple of years before this dispute arose. Bandekar was not doing any work of loading the ore in Gosalia Prospects. Merely carrying some messages to the members of the crew or some mail for being delivered to them would not be sufficient to claim that Bandekar was doing the work of loading the goods and that he could, therefore, be called dock worker. I am, therefore, of the view that Bandekar cannot be called as a dock worker so as to enable him to earn the pay and allowances to which the dock workers are entitled under the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers and the Wage Revision Committee.

13. Mr. Menon, the learned counsel for the Union, strenuously relied upon certain passages from the report of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers at Major Port in support of his submission that Bandekar should be held to be a workman. He referred to para 3.82 which deals with "other employers in the ports" and 3.83 which deals with "stevedores" and also to para 4.2.78 and 4-2-80. He also relied upon the definition of dock workers in the Dock Worker's (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948, which is quoted above. He placed emphasis on the concluding words "or leaving port". According to Mr. Menon these words being, very wide every sort of employee working in the port area would fall within the definition of dock worker. However, before an employee can be brought within the definition of 'dock worker' he must be connected with the work of loading and unloading or movement or storage of cargoes, if not directly, at least indirectly. It is difficult to accept the argument of Mr. Menon that it is sufficient that the workman must be connected with the ship. In the instant case here is no material at all to hold that the workman was directly or indirectly connected with the work of loading or unloading the cargoes. The expression "or leaving port" in the definition of dock worker, would not in my opinion cover the employee working in the port area though he is not at all connected with the work of loading and unloading or movement or storage of the cargo. It is true that when two interpretations are possible the interpretation i.e. favourable to the labour must be accepted. However, if the definition is read as a whole the connection of the employee directly or indirectly with the handling of the cargo is necessary to be established. These observations would be supported by what is stated by the Wage Board in para 6.6 in chapter VI at page 117 of the report of 1969. It may be mentioned that there is no reference to the Gosalia Prospects in the statement of claim in support of the submission that the company was doing the loading or unloading work at Goa. There is no evidence that the present workman Bandekar was in any way connected with the work of loading the ore on Gosalia Prospects which was managed by the company for the limited period of about two-and-a-half years. The evidence is that Bandekar carried certain documents to the vessel and those documents were connected with the crewmen. It is not proved that Bandekar did any work, even incidental to loading or unloading or clearance of cargoes when he visited the ships. The evidence shows that Bandekar was engaged as a peon in the office and in that capacity he carried certain documents to the vessel which are not proved to be in connection with the loading or unloading of the cargoes.

14. Reliance was placed upon the decision of the Bombay High Court in the case of *Tulsidas Khimji v. Jeejeebhoy* (1961 11 L.J. 42). That case, however, decided the question whether the Central Government was the competent authority or the State Government so far as the dispute in that case was concerned. The question whether any of the employees were dock workers does not appear to have been involved in that decision.

15. After the arguments of both the parties in this reference were heard I tried to see if some settlement as regards the wages of the workman was possible. I had suggested to the management to see if it could increase the present meagre scale of pay viz., s. 150 including dearness allowance, to some reasonable amount. The management, it appear made some proposals to the Union which the Union did not accept as the proposed increase was too meagre. This Tribunal is, however, helpless as the terms of the reference are limited to the question of finding out whether the management are justified in not implementing the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers and the Wage Revision Committee. I have held that the workman is not a port and dock worker. Under the circumstances, even though I am of the view that the present wages given to this workman are too meagre I cannot pass any order in his favour in this reference.

16. In the result this reference is answered by holding that the workman is not a port and dock worker. The management is, therefore, justified in not implementing the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for Port and Dock Workers and the Wage Revision Committee.

17. My award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M. D. KAMBLI Presiding Officer
[No. L-36012/2/78-D.IV(A)]
R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 14 जुलाई, 1983

कां०आ० 3037:—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि स्कीम, 1952 के पैरा 4 के उप-पैरा (1) के अनुसरण में और भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन श्रम रोजगार और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय (श्रम और रोजगार विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या कां०आ० 3140, दिनांक 29 अगस्त, 1967 और तत्कालीन श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या कां०आ० 3108, दिनांक 14 नवम्बर, 1974 को अधि-क्रान्त करते हुए, राजस्थान राज्य के लिए एक क्षेत्रीय समिति का गठन करती है, जिसमें निम्नलिखित व्यक्ति होंगे, अर्थात्:—

अध्यक्ष

1. सचिव, राजस्थान सरकार, श्रम विभाग, जयपुर। केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त।

सदस्य

2. उप सचिव, वित्त विभाग (व्यय-3), राजस्थान सरकार, जयपुर।
3. श्रम आयुक्त, राजस्थान सरकार, जयपुर।
4. श्री बी०एन० सोरल, महाप्रबन्धक, पोदार स्पनिंग मिल्स, पोदारपुरी, जयपुर।
5. श्री सुरेन्द्र कुमार जैन, प्रधान दि इम्प्लायमेंट एसोसिएशन आफ राजस्थान, पोदारपुरी, जयपुर।
6. श्री बी०के० आहूजा, मैरुम आहूजा इण्डस्ट्रीज, बी-85, इण्डस्ट्रियल एस्टेट बैसगोदाम, जयपुर।

राज्य सरकार की सकारिण पर केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त दो व्यक्ति।

राज्य में नियोजकों के संगठनों के परामर्श से केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त नियोजकों के तीन प्रतिनिधि।

7. श्री मोह० सूदीक,
प्रधान,
राष्ट्रीय मिल मजदूर संघ,
विजयनगर।

8. श्री ज्ञान देव आहूजा,
सचिव,
भारतीय मजदूर संघ आफिस्,
स्कीम न० 2,
न्यु यु आई टी कम्प्यूनिटी हाल,
भलवर, राजस्थान।

9. श्री एन०के० सोगानी,
राजस्थान कमेटी आफ दि
ए०आई०टी०यु०सी०
स्वासी कुमारानन्द भवन,
पीछे शालीमार सिनेमा,
जयपुर।

राज्य में कर्मचारियों के संगठनों के परामर्श से केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त कर्मचारियों के तीन प्रतिनिधि।

[संख्या बी-20012/1/78-पी०एफ०-2]

New Delhi, the 14th July, 1983

S.O. 3037.—In pursuance of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Labour Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) S.O. No. 3140 dated the 29th August, 1967 and late Ministry of Labour S.O. No. 3108 dated 14th November, 1974, the Central Government hereby sets up a Regional Committee for the State of Rajasthan, consisting of the following persons, namely:—

CHAIRMAN

1. Secretary to the Government Appointed by the of Rajasthan, Labour De- Central Government. partment, Jaipur.

MEMBERS

2. Deputy Secretary, Finance Department (Expenditure III) Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.
3. Labour Commissioner, Government of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

Two persons appointed by the Central Government on the recommendation of the State Government.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Shri V. N. Soral,
General Manager,
Poddar Spinning Mills,
Poddar puri, Jaipur. | } Three representatives
of employers appointed
by Central Government in Consultations with Organisations of employers in the State. |
| 5. Shri Surender Kumar Jain,
President,
The Employers' Association
of Rajasthan,
Podarpuri, Jaipur. | |
| 6. Shri V. K. Ahuja
M/s Ahuja Industries,
B.85, Industries Estate,
Baisgodam.,
Jaipur. | } Three representatives
of employees appointed
by Central Government in consultation with Employees Organisations the State. |
| 7. Shri Modh. Saddiq,
President,
Rashtriya Mill Mazdoor
Sangh, Bijaynagar. | |
| 8. Shri Gyan Dev Ahuja,
Secretary,
Bhartiya Mazdoor Sangh
Office, Scheme No. 2,
New UIT Community Hall,
Alwar, Rajasthan. | |
| 9. Shri N. K. Sogani,
Rajasthan Committee of the
All India Trade Union Congress,
Swami Kumaranand
Bhavan, Behind Shalimar
Cinema, Jaipur. | |

[V. 20012(1)/78-PF. II]

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3038.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह समाधान हो गया है कि सेंट्रल पोल्ट्री ब्रीडिंग फार्म चंडीगढ़ के कर्मचारी उन प्रमुविधाओं को प्राप्त कर रहे हैं जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम 1948 (1948 का 34) के अधीन उपबंधित प्रमुविधाओं के सारतः समरूप है

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 91क के साथ पठित धारा 90 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा निगम से परामर्श करने के पश्चात् उपरोक्त कारखाने को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से 1 मई, 1970 से 30 सितम्बर, 1983 तक की अवधि के लिए जिसमें यह तारीख भी सम्मिलित है, छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट निम्नलिखित शर्तों के अधीन है अर्थात्:—

- (1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक उस अवधि की बाबत जिस के दौरान वह कारखाना उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन के अधीन था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया

है) ऐसी विवरणियाँ ऐसे प्ररूप और विशिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी,

- (2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक या निगम का इसी निमित्त प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी—

- (i) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरणी को विशिष्टियों को सत्यापित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए, या

- (ii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम 1950 द्वारा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गए थे या नहीं, या

- (iii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कि कर्मचारी नियोजक द्वारा दी गई उन प्रमुविधाओं को जो ऐसी प्रमुविधाएं हैं, जिनके प्रतिफलस्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है या नहीं, या

- (iv) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनों के लिए कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में अधिनियम के उपबंध प्रवृत्त थे ऐसे किन्हीं उपबंधों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए सशक्त होगा,—

- (क) प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जो वह आवश्यक समझे, या

- (ख) ऐसे प्रधान नियोजक का अव्यवहित नियोजक के अभियोगाधीन कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके भारसाधक व्यक्ति से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के संवाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेख, बहियाँ और अन्य दस्तावेज ऐसे नियोजक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उसकी परीक्षा करने दे या वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दें जो वह आवश्यक समझे, या

- (ग) प्रधान नियोजक या अव्यवहित नियोजक की उसके अधिकर्ता या सेवक की या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति

की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि वह कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना,

- (घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर लेखाबही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।

[संख्या एस-38014/43/82-एच० आई]

व्याख्यात्मक तालिका

इस मामले में छूट की मंजूरी के लिए प्रार्थनापत्र देर से प्राप्त हुआ था इसलिए छूट की भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देना आवश्यक हो गया है। यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि छूट की भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देने से किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 3038.—Whereas the Central Government is satisfied that the employees of the Central Poultry Breeding Farm, Chandigarh, are otherwise in receipt of benefits substantially similar to the benefits provided under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948);

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 90, read with section 91A, of the said Act, the Central Government, after consultation with the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, hereby exempts the above mentioned factory from the operation of the said Act for a period with effect from 1st May, 1970 upto and inclusive of the 30th September, 1983.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(2) Any inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—

- (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period; or
- (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
- (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
- (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act has been complied with during the period when

such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory;

by empowered to—

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found incharge thereof to produce to such inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[No. S-38014/43/82-HI]

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case, as the application for exemption was received late. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.

का० आ० 3039.—केन्द्रीय सरकार कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1556 तारीख 31 मार्च, 1982 के अनुक्रम में मैसर्स इण्ड्रामेंटेशन लिमिटेड, कोटा (राजस्थान) को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से, पहली जुलाई, 1982 से 30 जून, 1983 तक जिसमें यह तारीख भी सम्मिलित है एक वर्ष की और अवधि के लिए छूट देती है।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट की शर्तें निम्नलिखित हैं अर्थात् :—

- (1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक, उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवर्तमान था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया है) ऐसी विवरणियाँ ऐसे प्ररूप में और ऐसी विधि-पट्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी,
- (2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा

(1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक, या निगम का इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी—

(1) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरणों की विविधियों को स्थापित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ, या

(2) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गये थे या नहीं, या

(3) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी नियोजक द्वारा दिए गए उन फायदों को, जिसके प्रतिफल स्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं, या

(4) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अवधि के दौरान जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबंधों को अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं,

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिये सशक्त होगा :—

(क) प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक समझता है, या

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक के अभिभोगाधीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के संदाय से संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहियां और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने दें या उन्हें ऐसी जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं, या

(ग) प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक को, उसके अभिकर्ता या सेवक की, ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में पाया जाए या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना,

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल तैयार करना या ऐसे उद्धरण लेना।

[संख्या एस-38014/40/82-एच० आई०]

व्याख्यात्मक भाषण

इस मामले में पूर्वी भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देना आवश्यक हो गया है, क्योंकि छूट के लिए प्राप्त आवेदन-पत्र पर कार्रवाई करने पर समय लगा। तथापि, यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देने से किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

S.O. 3039.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87 read with section 91A, of the Employees' State Insurance Act 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1556 dated the 31st March, 1982, the Central Government hereby exempts M/s. Instrumentation Limited, Kota (Rajasthan) from the operation of the said Act, for a further period of one year with effect from the 1st July, 1982 upto and inclusive of the 30th June 1983.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period), such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(2) Any inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—

(i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period; or

(ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or

(iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or

(iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory;

be empowered to—

(a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or

(b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found incharge thereof to produce to such inspector or other official and allow him to examine such account, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or

- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant, or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[No. S-38014/40/82-HI]

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3040.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 34) की धारा 91-क के साथ पठित धारा 87 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 487, तारीख 25 जनवरी, 1982 के अनुक्रम में नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय के अधीन एक पब्लिक सेक्टर उपक्रम, कोचीन शिपयार्ड लिमिटेड, कोचीन को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रवर्तन से 1 जुलाई, 1982 से 30 जून, 1983 तक की अवधि के लिए जिसमें यह तारीख भी सम्मिलित है, छूट देनी है।

2. पूर्वोक्त छूट की शर्तें निम्नलिखित हैं, अर्थात्:—

(1) उक्त कारखाने का नियोजक, उस अवधि की बाबत जिसके दौरान उस कारखाने पर उक्त अधिनियम प्रवर्तमान था (जिसे इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त अवधि कहा गया है), ऐसी विवरणियाँ, ऐसे प्ररूप में और ऐसी विनिष्टियों सहित देगा जो कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 के अधीन उसे उक्त अवधि की बाबत देनी थी ;

(2) निगम द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 45 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन नियुक्त किया गया कोई निरीक्षक, या निगम का इस निमित्त प्राधिकृत कोई अन्य पदधारी—

(i) धारा 44 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन, उक्त अवधि की बाबत दी गई किसी विवरणी की विनिष्टियों को सत्यपित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ; या

(ii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी राज्य बीमा (साधारण) विनियम, 1950 द्वारा यथा अपेक्षित रजिस्टर और अभिलेख, उक्त अवधि के लिए रखे गए थे, या नहीं; या

(iii) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि कर्मचारी नियोजक द्वारा दिए गए उन फायदों को, जिसके प्रतिफलस्वरूप इस अधिसूचना के अधीन छूट दी जा रही है, नकद में और वस्तु रूप में पाने का हकदार बना हुआ है, या नहीं; या

(iv) यह अभिनिश्चित करने के प्रयोजनार्थ कि उस अवधि के दौरान, जब उक्त कारखाने के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध प्रवृत्त थे, ऐसे किन्हीं उपबन्धों का अनुपालन किया गया था या नहीं;

निम्नलिखित कार्य करने के लिए, मशकत होगा:—

(क) प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक से अपेक्षा करना कि वह उसे ऐसी जानकारी दे जिसे उपरोक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी आवश्यक समझता है; या

(ख) ऐसे प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक के अधिभोगाधीन किसी कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में किसी भी उचित समय पर प्रवेश करना और उसके प्रभारी से यह अपेक्षा करना कि वह व्यक्तियों के नियोजन और मजदूरी के संदाय में संबंधित ऐसे लेखा, बहियाँ और अन्य दस्तावेज, ऐसे निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करें और उनकी परीक्षा करने दें, या उन्हें ऐसी जानकारी दें जिसे वे आवश्यक समझते हैं; या

(ग) प्रधान या अव्यवहित नियोजक को, उसके अभिकर्ता या सेवक की, ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जो ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर, में पाया जाए, या ऐसे किसी व्यक्ति की जिसके बारे में उक्त निरीक्षक या अन्य पदधारी के पास यह विश्वास करने का युक्तियुक्त कारण है कि कर्मचारी है, परीक्षा करना;

(घ) ऐसे कारखाने, स्थापन, कार्यालय या अन्य परिसर में रखे गए किसी रजिस्टर, लेखाबही या अन्य दस्तावेज की नकल तैयार करना या उससे उद्धरण लेना।

[संख्या एस-38014/27/82-एच० आई०]

ए० के० भट्टराई, अवर सचिव

व्याख्यात्मक ज्ञापन

इस मामले में छूट को भूतलक्षी प्रभाव देना आवश्यक हो गया है क्योंकि छूट के लिए आवेदन पर कार्यवाही करने में कुछ समय लग गया। तथापि यह प्रमाणित किया जाता है कि भूतलक्षी प्रभाव से छूट देने में किसी के हित पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा।

New Delhi, the 16th July, 83

S.O. 3040.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 97 read with section 91A of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S. O. 487 dated the 25th January, 1982 the Central Government hereby exempts the Cochin Shipyard Limited, Cochin, a Public Sector Undertaking under the Ministry of Shipyard and Transport from the operation of the said Act for a further period of one year with effect from 1st July, 1982 upto and inclusive of the 30th June, 1983.

2. The above exemption is subject to the following conditions, namely :—

(1) The employer of the said factory shall submit in respect of the period during which that factory was subject to the operation of the said Act (hereinafter referred to as the said period) such returns in such form and containing such particulars as were due from it in respect of the said period under the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950;

(2) Any Inspector appointed by the Corporation under sub-section (1) of section 45 of the said Act or other official of the Corporation authorised in this behalf shall, for the purposes of—

- (i) verifying the particulars contained in any return submitted under sub-section (1) of section 44 for the said period; or
- (ii) ascertaining whether registers and records were maintained as required by the Employees' State Insurance (General) Regulations, 1950 for the said period; or
- (iii) ascertaining whether the employees continue to be entitled to benefits provided by the employer in cash and kind being benefits in consideration of which exemption is being granted under this notification; or
- (iv) ascertaining whether any of the provisions of the said Act has been complied with during the period when such provisions were in force in relation to the said factory;

- (a) require the principal or immediate employer to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (b) enter any factory, establishment, office or other premises occupied by such principal or immediate employer at any reasonable time and require any person found incharge thereof to produce to such Inspector or other official and allow him to examine such accounts, books and other documents relating to the employment of persons and payment of wages or to furnish to him such information as he may consider necessary; or
- (c) examine the principal or immediate employer, his agent or servant or any person found in such factory, establishment, office or other premises or any person whom the said Inspector or other official has reasonable cause to believe to have been an employee; or
- (d) make copies of or take extracts from any register, account book or other document maintained in such factory, establishment, office or other premises.

[No. 38014/27/82-HI]

A. K. BHATTARAI, Under Secy.

EXPLANATORY MEMORANDUM

It has become necessary to give retrospective effect to the exemption in this case as the processing of the application for exemption took time. However, it is certified that the grant of exemption with retrospective effect will not affect the interest of anybody adversely.